

Mr. LOGAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. If he were present, I understand he would vote as I intend to vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—33

Adams	Connally	King	Russell
Bailey	Couzens	Loneragan	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dieterich	McKellar	Smith
Bilbo	Duffy	Murphy	Thomas, Utah
Black	Fletcher	Norris	Trammell
Brown	Gerry	Overton	Walsh
Bulow	Gore	Pittman	
Byrnes	Harrison	Radclyffe	
Caraway	Hatch	Robinson	

NAYS—34

Austin	Costigan	McGill	Schall
Bachman	Donahay	McNary	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Metcalf	Shipstead
Bulkley	Gibson	Minton	Steiner
Burke	Hale	Moore	Vandenberg
Capper	La Follette	Murray	Van Nuys
Carey	Lewis	Neely	White
Clark	Logan	Nye	
Copeland	McCarran	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—23

Ashurst	Davis	Johnson	Reynolds
Barkley	Dickinson	Keyes	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	George	Long	Townsend
Borah	Glass	McAdoo	Truman
Byrd	Guffy	Maloney	Tydings
Coolidge	Hastings	Norbeck	Wagner
Cutting	Hayden	Pope	Wheeler

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. GLASS (subsequently said): Mr. President, I was necessarily absent from the Chamber when a motion was made to take a recess. The RECORD does not show how I would have voted had I been here. I desire the RECORD to show that I would have voted to adjourn, and against the recess, had I been permitted to vote; but I was paired on the question with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING]. Therefore, nothing was lost by my absence.

Had I been present, I would, of course, have voted to adjourn, and therefore to dispose, for the time being, of this wretched bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understood there was a motion pending to take a recess until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion was made to adjourn until Monday, and the motion was rejected.

RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT (putting the question). The Chair is in doubt.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, April 27, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 26, 1935

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Father of the eternal past, we rejoice that there is one God, one law, one element, and one far-off event toward which the whole creation moves; with passionate hope help us to cling to this ideal. By the tranquil guidance of Thy Holy Spirit, O carry on the work of man's redemption. Bring unity into the divided and estranged members of the family universal. Lift the clouds of discord and reveal the divine purpose to the pressing hosts of earth. Be with us, our Heavenly Father, and arm us with jealous care; may we be chivalrous of heart toward the weak, always striving higher for the standards of personal honor. Bless

and strengthen with the spirit of forgiveness of injuries and with the other excellences of unsullied manhood. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that amendments will be offered at the very beginning of the reading of the naval-appropriation bill, it is highly important, in my judgment, that we should at least have 100 Members present, a quorum of the Committee.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman from Georgia is going to make the point of no quorum, I want to say that you will not, by unanimous consent, meet at 11 o'clock hereafter.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. During the 21 years that I have been here I have never made a point of no quorum, but I think the House should know what the amendments are and have a large number of the Membership present.

Mr. SNELL. That is all right; we yielded to meet at 11 o'clock today at the request of the majority leader, but I am opposed to coming here at 11 o'clock and wasting an hour in the call for a quorum.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not willing to take up these amendments without having at least a quorum of the Committee present.

Mr. SNELL. All right, go ahead; but we will not come in at 11 o'clock hereafter.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Georgia to withhold his point of no quorum. We will endeavor to have the whip get Members in as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the majority leader, for the time being I will withdraw the point of no quorum, but I do insist that there shall be at least a quorum of the Committee present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The only reason that I asked to have the House meet at 11 o'clock was with hope that we might finish the bill today. A large number of Members have stated that they want to go out of town tomorrow to attend to other official matters, and the House has agreed to adjourn this afternoon until Monday, and we are quite anxious to finish the bill today.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. You can count on my full co-operation to expedite the consideration of the bill, but when we consider these amendments to the bill I think we should have a quorum present.

WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL-GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk Senate Joint Resolution 43 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reported the title, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 43 for the establishment of a commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard connecting the present Lincoln Memorial in the city of Washington with the battlefield at Gettysburg in the State of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think a resolution of this importance ought to be taken up out of order and passed by unanimous consent. I do not know when all of this continued orgy of money-spending is going to stop. It has got to stop some day. If it does not, our Nation will be bankrupt. I am not willing to tax the posterity of the American people for all of this continued debt making when we have no reasonable assurance they will have means of paying, when the inevitable pay day comes.

Mr. HAINES. This resolution has passed the Senate.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, anything on God's earth can pass—somewhere else. They have recently passed a bill—and a House committee is now holding hearings on it—to spend \$3,500,000 to ruin this Capitol Building, one of the best types of colonial buildings anywhere on earth. That passed the Senate without the majority of the Senators knowing anything about it.

Americans spend millions of dollars abroad every year looking at old buildings in Europe, but as soon as a build-

ing gets old in this country they want to ruin it or tear it down. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COTTON

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not try to call up my cotton resolution this morning, but give notice that I shall do so on Monday next.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval-appropriation bill, with Mr. McCormack in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

For laboratory and research work and other necessary work of the naval research laboratory for the benefit of the naval service, including operation and maintenance of a laboratory, additions to equipment necessary properly to carry on work in hand, maintenance of buildings and grounds, temporary employment of such scientific and technical civilian assistants as may become necessary, and subscriptions to technical periodicals, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, \$310,000: *Provided*, That \$50,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the temporary employment of civilian scientists and technicians required on special problems: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$90,000, in addition to the amount authorized by the preceding proviso.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CARY: Page 5, line 15, strike out "\$90,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$120,000."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not add any money to the bill. The committee increased this appropriation \$100,000. Of that amount we made \$30,000 available for the appointment of civilian scientists and technicians, the remainder being for general appropriation uses. Admiral Robinson, the Chief of the Bureau of Engineering, has indicated to me that to get full value out of the additional amount, it more than likely would be necessary to expand the staff of nontechnical civilian employees, and has suggested that the limitation upon the total pay of such employees be expanded to the figure stated in the amendment. The amendment adds nothing to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Instruction: For postgraduate instruction of officers in other than civil government and literature, and for special instruction, education, and individual training of officers and enlisted men at home and abroad, including maintenance of students abroad, except aviation training and submarine training otherwise appropriated for, \$178,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of any expense incident to giving special educational courses or postgraduate instruction to officers with view to qualifying them or better qualifying them for the performance of duties required to be performed by or in pursuance of law by officers of the Supply Corps, Construction Corps, or Corps of Civil Engineers, except present students and except such officers who are commissioned in such corps or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than 2 years;

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 8, strike out lines 12 to 22, inclusive.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to submit an amendment. Strike out lines 12 to 22, inclusive, page 8. This new language inserted in the appropriation bill which I move to strike out is personnel legislation under the guise of a limitation. I may add that this question, that is the detail of line officers for specialist duty has heretofore been fully considered by the Naval Affairs Committee of the House which Committee recommended legislation to the House embodied in H. R. 5599 which passed the House on March 27, 1935, and is now pending before the Senate. The provisions I refer to are in section 6 providing for transfer of line officers to the staff. This provision was inserted in order to improve the quality of specialists within the Navy, that is, it enables the Secretary of the Navy to transfer from the line to the Construction Corps, the Civil Engineer Corps, or the Supply Corps, a line officer at a later date than is now permitted under existing law. This delay will give the Department a greater period of demonstrated experience from which to select officers who may show a particular aptitude and a desire for the special duties of the staff corps. It is also the long-established practice with regard to the most numerous specialist branch in the Navy—the marine engineers. As this practice has operated for so long a time to the great satisfaction and efficiency of the marine engineers of the Navy, a highly specialized group, it is only reasonable to assume that the same practice will operate similarly for the other staff specialties mentioned. It conforms in general to civilian practice. A doctor must be a doctor prior to being a specialist in any branch of medicine or surgery. The legislation which has passed the House, H. R. 5599, will enable the staff corps concerned to more carefully select and to surely obtain officers of proven ability in their particular specialties instead of taking in young men of slight experience who may prove to be unsatisfactory.

The provision inserted by the Appropriations Committee of the House which I seek to strike out will be uneconomical, and will be contrary to the best efficiency of the Navy. The present practice is to assign young officers with from 2 to 7 years' commissioned service to special instruction for the Civil Engineer Corps, the Construction Corps, and the Supply Corps. It is believed that this period of time is necessary in order that the young officers concerned may have time to demonstrate their suitability for specialist work, and that the best available material may be selected for the important work of the specialist corps.

As I said before, the Naval Affairs Committee has carefully studied this question and is convinced that the language inserted by the Appropriations Committee should be stricken out, and that the plans embodied in H. R. 5599 should be given a fair trial. The Navy Department agrees with the Naval Affairs Committee, as indicated in its recommendation thereon, which is in accordance with the report of a reorganization board of March 6, 1934, approved by the President.

Any prevention by legislative enactment of a free selection of specialists in the Navy would be destructive of efficiency.

It appears that the inserted language is impossible of any reasonable execution. The course of postgraduate instruction for the Construction Corps and the Civil Engineer Corps is 3 years. Manifestly, an officer of the line, if he should be sent to the postgraduate school immediately upon graduation would, under the provision under discussion, have to be transferred to the corps concerned upon completion of only 2 years of his postgraduate instruction before having fully demonstrated his ability in order that he may pursue the course to completion.

Mr. PEARSON. Will the gentleman's amendment mean an increase in the appropriation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. It will mean a reduction.

If the provision recommended by the Appropriations Committee should become a law, it will result in considerably more officers being commissioned for limited corps duties than under the present and proposed plan of the Navy Department.

The authorized number of officers in the different staff corps in the Navy allowed by existing law is as follows:

Medical Corps, 1,207; Supply Corps, 660; Construction Corps, 275; Civil Engineer Corps, 110; Chaplain Corps, 149; Dental Corps, 186; Professors of Mathematics, 1.

The Department is now in process of reaching a radical reduction in the number of officers in the different staff corps and expects eventually to have the number reduced to the following numbers: Medical Corps, 745; Supply Corps, 440; Construction Corps, 140; Civil Engineer Corps, 80; Chaplain Corps, 76; Dental Corps, 211. A total reduction in all the staff corps of 329 officers will eventually result in a material saving in the annual expenditures for pay of the Navy on both the active and retired lists.

This plan in operation since March 1934 has already accomplished a reduction of 57 in the total number of staff officers.

It is my personal belief that the Navy now has a greater number of officers in some of the staff corps than is necessary to efficiency, and that the demands of economy in annual expenditures for pay of the Navy necessitate keeping the number down to that strength which is necessary. The Navy Department is at the present time endeavoring to accomplish this reduction by the slow process of normal attrition, which will give the staff corps concerned ample time to adjust their processes to meet the reduction, and which will not adversely affect the prospects of any individual now in the service.

As an illustration of the possibility of economy in expenditures for the personnel of naval staff corps, the following comparison of the number of staff officers in comparable navies is interesting:

<i>Medical officers</i>	
American Navy.....	836
Japanese Navy.....	502
British Navy.....	346

We have more than twice as many medical officers as the British Navy.

<i>Naval constructors</i>	
American Navy.....	224
British Navy.....	118
Japanese Navy.....	74

We have nearly twice as many naval constructors as the British Navy.

<i>Civil engineers</i>	
American Navy.....	107
British Navy.....	59

We have nearly twice as many civil engineers as the British Navy.

It is natural that each staff corps should desire to increase its membership to such a number as can be justified by the desires and the vision of the persons interested, and without adequate consideration of the essential necessity for over-all economy in annual expenditures for the Navy.

The enactment of the provision which my amendment proposes to strike out will result in an immediate demand for an increase in the numerical strength of the staff corps concerned with a resulting extravagance of expenditures in future years.

It will also in the opinion of both the Naval Affairs Committee and the Navy Department accomplish a reduction in the quality of the officers selected for assignment to the highly technical specialist work of the corps, and in a definite decrease in the existing efficiency of the Navy.

I have a full appreciation of the present efficiency and superior performance of the staff corps of the Navy; and particularly with the purpose of maintaining, and if possible improving, the superior standards and accomplishments of the individuals who will in the future be intrusted with the specialist technical work of the Navy, I propose that this proposed unworkable limitation on freedom of selection by the Secretary of the Navy be eliminated from the current naval-appropriation bill.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 18 minutes, and that one-half of the time may be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLeod].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman to move to close debate, but the Chair has the responsibility of recognizing Members.

The gentleman from Kentucky moves that all debate on this amendment close in 18 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, the question raised by the gentleman from Georgia of limiting officers in the several staff corps is not involved in this proposition at all; it has nothing whatever to do with it. I was very much surprised, indeed, to hear him stand up on the floor of this House and talk about economy in a naval-appropriation bill. What we are trying to do in this bill is to at least maintain the existing degree of efficiency in the Navy of the United States, and that naturally would result in economy.

The portion of this proviso to which objection is raised is comprised within the last two lines, which read:

Or who has not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than 2 years.

We are only undertaking to require conformance with what the law has provided should be done all these years, because rather recently high Navy officials have begun to disregard it and have been attempting to procure their staff officers in a way suitable to them without any regard for what the Congress has said about it in years past.

Mr. Chairman, on pages 8 and 9 of the report on this bill will be found the explanation for the inclusion of this limitation. I enlarged upon that explanation in my speech on the bill last Tuesday—page 6234 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is little more that I can add.

The Nation pointed with pride to the way the Navy functioned during the war. That was the acid test. That was the proof of the efficiency and effectiveness of its organization. It had a trained and efficient line and it had a trained and efficient staff. Each had prepared well and each functioned well-nigh perfectly. And why? Simply because each was composed and directed by men who were trained specialists in their allotted fields.

Let me recall to you some names of outstanding specialists: Chief Constructor Bowles; Chief Constructor Capps; Chief Constructor D. W. Taylor, internationally known and an international authority; the present chief constructor, Jerry Land, whom you all know; Naval Constructor Du Bose, who is a real genius.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. CARY. I do not like to be interrupted.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Captain Du Bose, whose name the gentleman just referred to, endorsed the Department's report.

Mr. CARY. Possibly the gentleman has a right to that inference. I know whereof I speak when I say that staff officers generally do not and have not endorsed it. The fact of the matter is they are afraid to come out and say anything; they are afraid they will get their heads chopped off if they do; and the gentleman from Georgia knows it as well as I do.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, not at all.

Mr. CARY. Let me continue with the names of a few more renowned specialists. There were Sam McGowan, the war-time Paymaster General; Admiral Peoples, the most capable and popular present Paymaster General; Admiral Harris, the war-time Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks; and our very capable friend, Admiral Parsons, but recently head of that Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, none of these men had or has a peer in his particular field. There are many others I might name, and they attained or have attained their distinguished positions because they started in as specialists right out of Annapolis or college and continued as specialists throughout their naval service.

This provision is directed at a move to let men prepare for specialist duty even when they have reached midlife; to let them alternate between line and specialist duty; to educate them as specialists and leave to their election whether or not they shall permanently become specialists. In short, it is directed at a move that spells ruin for these splendid, effi-

cient staff corps, which are so largely responsible for the standing the Navy has in the business world today.

I have been told by naval officers that it is their judgment that none of the outstanding officers trained as specialists under the scheme now afoot will elect permanent specialty duty after receiving this special training; that only those officers who will be fearful of a line selection board—in other words, the least promising material—will volunteer for permanent special duty. I concur in that view.

The Navy's specialists should be equal or superior to those of the industry. It is my judgment, by this system we are trying to curb, that the matériel efficiency of the Navy is left to chance. At present the Navy's matériel efficiency is excellent, so why change? For greater efficiency we should be working to expand it to include ordnance, aeronautics, and engineering. Such a course conforms to the judgment of both the recent Baker Board and the Howell Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this new arrangement does not have the approval of members of the staff corps affected, and that if a poll could be had of their views they would be found to be overwhelmingly against it. They have not been consulted. It is but the initial step to complete amalgamation with the line. When that time comes, if it ever shall, you will have a lot of line officers nominally in charge of activities now directed and performed by specially trained staff officers, with civilian technicians and warrant officers and petty officers actually doing the work. It borders on a crime, gentlemen, to do aught to tear down the splendid system that has prevailed down through the years.

Do you think, Mr. Chairman, it is a proper thing for us to do to wait until naval officers have performed 12 or 14 years of duty in the line and then decide to pick them out and train them along some special line? Or should we take the young graduates from the Naval Academy and begin to prepare them for this special work as soon as they come out of the academy? Under the plan the gentleman from Georgia is endorsing we will let men stay in the Navy as much as 12 or 14 years before we start preparing them as specialists, a time when they ought to be giving their best service as specialists to their country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there is but one thing to this proposition and that is whether in the interest of efficiency we are going to require these staff officers to be started upon their careers within 2 years after they have graduated from the Naval Academy, or permit someone high up in authority among the line officers to say we shall educate men at the expense of the Government after they have reached middle life and then make it optional with them whether they perform specialized duties for the Government.

I think in the cause of efficiency we should require that when these men are selected as specialists they be selected within 2 years after they come out of the Academy in order that the Government may get the full benefit of whatever their services may be worth. I think it is a mistake to do it in any other way. I think it should be done as it has been done heretofore, and if we will do that we will continue to have efficiency in the Navy. The Congress should say how these staff officers shall be selected, and not some two or three high-ranking line officers in the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. Vinson of Georgia)—ayes 23, noes 80. So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY, SUBSISTENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Pay of naval personnel: For pay allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting

orders (not to exceed 908 officers of the Medical Corps, 186 officers of the Dental Corps, 556 officers of the Supply Corps, 83 officers of the Chaplain Corps, 233 officers of the Construction Corps, 109 officers of the Civil Engineer Corps, and 1,461 warrant and commissioned warrant officers: *Provided*, That if the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers and officers in any staff corps holding commission on July 1, 1935, is in excess of the number herein stipulated, such excess officers may be retained in the Navy until the number is reduced to the limitations imposed by this act), pay—\$32,948,940, including not to exceed \$1,628,858 for increased pay for making aerial flights, no part of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by more than three rear admirals nor by nonflying officers or observers at a rate in excess of \$1,440 per annum, which shall be the legal maximum rate as to such nonflying officers or observers; rental allowance, \$6,685,447; subsistence allowance, \$4,257,791; in all, \$43,892,178; officers on the retired list, \$7,717,150; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$3,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$6,050,042; interest on deposits by men, \$3,000; pay of petty officers (not to exceed an average of 7,040 chief petty officers, of which number those with a permanent appointment as chief petty officer shall not exceed an average of 6,150), seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, extra pay for men for diving, and cash prizes (not to exceed \$75,000) for men for excellence in gunnery, target practice, communication, and engineering competitions, \$73,872,972; outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment, civilian clothing not to exceed \$15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct or undesirability or inaptitude, reimbursement in kind of clothing to persons in the Navy for losses in cases of marine or aircraft disasters or in the operation of water- or air-borne craft, and the authorized issue of clothing and equipment to the members of the Nurse Corps, \$2,246,523; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court martial, \$64,400, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; pay and allowances of the Nurse Corps, including assistant superintendents, directors and assistant directors—pay, \$498,320; rental allowance, \$15,840; subsistence allowance, \$15,152; pay retired list, \$176,424; in all, \$705,736; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps; pay and allowances of transferred and assigned men of the Fleet Naval Reserve, \$12,125,039; reimbursement for losses of property as provided in the act approved October 6, 1917 (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 981, 982), as amended by the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 34, sec. 983), \$10,000; payment of 6 months' death gratuity, \$100,000; in all, \$146,790,040; and no part of such sum shall be available to pay active-duty pay and allowances to officers in excess of 6 on the retired list, except retired officers temporarily ordered to active duty as members of retiring and selection boards as authorized by law: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, no officer of the Navy shall be entitled to receive an addition to his pay in consequence of the provisions of the act approved May 13, 1908 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 867): *Provided further*, That, except for the public quarters occupied by the Chief of Office of Naval Operations, the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, and the commandant of the Marine Corps and messes temporarily set up on shore for officers attached to seagoing vessels, to aviation units based on seagoing vessels, including officers' messes at the fleet air bases, and to landing forces and expeditions, no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or other expenses of any enlisted man or civil employee performing service in the residence or quarters of an officer or officers on shore as a cook, waiter, or other work of a character performed by a household servant, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Naval Reserve without additional expense to the Government, nor the sale of meals to officers by general messes on shore as regulated by detailed instructions from the Navy Department.

Mr. McGrath. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGrath: On page 25, line 14, after the word "of", strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eight."

Mr. Cary. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable. The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel, \$168,283,083, of which sum \$1,000,000 shall be immediately available, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel", shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the Medical Department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Administration in naval

hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers appropriated for in this act: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipmen whose admission subsequent to January 30, 1935, would result in exceeding at any time an allowance of 4 midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress; of 1 midshipman for Puerto Rico, a native of the island, appointed on nomination of the Governor, and of 4 midshipmen from Puerto Rico, appointed on nomination of the Resident Commissioner; and of 4 midshipmen from the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify in any way existing laws relative to the appointment of midshipmen at large, from the enlisted personnel of the naval service, or from the Naval Reserve: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calendar year 1936 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy in full commission for at least 9 months prior to such admission.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MAVERICK: Page 29, line 17, after the word "of", strike out "four" and insert "three"; in line 20, after the word "of", strike out "four" and insert "three"; in line 22, after the word "of", strike out "four" and insert "three."

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to keep the appointments at Annapolis to just exactly what they are at this time and not to reduce the present number of Annapolis cadets. The present allotment is sufficient; no necessity exists for an increase.

I want to call attention to the fact that West Point has 1,220 cadets and there are now 1,622 midshipmen in the Naval Academy at Annapolis. There are 118,000 soldiers in the Army, which will be increased by approximately 47,000 men. There are 81,000 enlisted men in the Navy and they already have 400 more cadets than West Point; 345 midshipmen will graduate from Annapolis this year and all will be commissioned in the Navy. In various years Annapolis has graduated too many midshipmen who have been unable to obtain commissions as ensigns.

May I call attention to one other thing: I received a letter from the Navy Department, Bureau of Navigation, which calls attention to the fact that this law will be brought up. I believe it is poor taste on the part of the Navy Department or the War Department to tell a Congressman in advance what kind of a law he is going to pass and then offer him an appointment in the Navy. Is the Navy running Congress or Congress running the Navy? This looks to me as just a little bit of gratuitous advice from the Navy Department. It may be considered by other gentleman as a courtesy and it may be intended as such. Of course, I do not think there is anything particularly sinister in it, but I am sure it is intended to make us favor this legislation so we can have another appointment to pass out.

On the general subject of education may I say that we have heard on this floor the statement made that after a man leaves Annapolis he has to go to universities and technical colleges to obtain special training. But do you ever think of it? A man may go to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he may get education in marine engineering, shipbuilding, steam engineering, and get a good education along those and other lines. That man, however, cannot get an appointment in the Navy because of this old caste system which they have in the Navy, where everybody has to be a graduate of Annapolis, the United States Naval Academy. Now, what about the Army? The Army has always taken in civilians from the various colleges and these men have been trained to be very fine officers. They get into the Army and they receive a reasonable amount of military training.

The argument is going to be made that this seafaring stuff is a mysterious sort of thing, and that it is necessary to go to the Naval Academy in order to serve the Navy. That is not so at all. If a man has a sound college education, and if he can receive a little Navy experience and learn navigation, he will be as good as any officer in the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, here is what I object to. We ought to give the boys of this country a chance to get in the Navy, and I refer particularly to those boys who are not lucky enough to

get a congressional appointment. These boys go to the universities in Nebraska, Texas, Washington, and other States and get a good education.

When a man goes to Annapolis or West Point, his teacher stands before him, not to teach him facts but to make him believe in a certain thing. As I said on the floor yesterday, they take these boys, put them in pots, pour hot metal in there, then send them out and use them as officers in the Army and Navy. Of course, they learn good manners at the Naval Academy and they get a good education. But you cannot tell me that a man who is a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology or any other good college, and he has a reasonable amount of training, cannot become as good a naval officer as a graduate of Annapolis. This is going to give the Congressman an additional appointment. As far as I am concerned, that is not an inducement and I do not think any Member particularly wants the appointment. But that is not the point. The point is we ought to have a Navy organization where they do not take a boy 17 years old, but one 21 years old, one who has a reasonable amount of maturity, as well as a good general education along economic lines and other lines, so that he may be broad-minded mentally to serve in the Navy.

So I believe we should not increase the number of midshipmen, but give other young people a chance.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Let me make one more point and then I will yield to the gentleman.

We have already increased the Naval Reserve, especially for fliers, and one of the arguments that has been made in favor of increasing the number of cadets is that we needed more young men for the Air Service, but with this increased Naval Reserve that is not necessary.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DARDEN. Do I understand that the gentleman is not opposed to the increase in the number of midshipmen, but wants to distribute them in a fashion different from that which now obtains?

Mr. MAVERICK. I am opposed to increasing the number of midshipmen at Annapolis. I want to make it so that a man who is graduated from a college like the Massachusetts Institute of Technology can join the Navy, and probably in a year can learn navigation after he has had a course of study in marine engineering, steam engineering, and mechanical engineering, and then may become as efficient an officer as a man who has been at the Naval Academy.

Mr. DARDEN. But the gentleman is agreeable to the additional appointments?

Mr. MAVERICK. No; I am opposed to the additional appointments at Annapolis.

Mr. MAVERICK obtained unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks, and to insert therein a letter from the Navy Department.

The letter is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1935.

HON. MAURY MAVERICK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAVERICK: The Navy Department and the Bureau of the Budget have recommended to Congress that the quota of midshipmen for each Senator, Representative and Delegate in Congress be increased from three to four. In contemplation of this increase being provided for in the current Naval Appropriation bill, and in view of the necessity for prompt action prior to the actual passage of the bill, in the way of making arrangements for the admission of midshipmen to the Naval Academy this summer, an entrance examination will be held on June 17, 1935 for candidates nominated for these vacancies.

In order to afford ample time in which to make arrangements to hold the examination, it will be necessary that your nominations reach the Bureau not later than May 29. While the law does not require these nominations to be made until March 4, 1936, the opportunity of making the nominations at this time is offered in case you do not wish to hold the vacancy over until next year. Nomination blanks are enclosed herewith.

There are three methods of qualifying mentally for admission to the Naval Academy:

(1) By passing the regular mental examination in all six subjects.

(2) By submission of an acceptable certificate of credits on graduation from an accredited secondary school, and passing a substantiating examination in English and mathematics.

(3) By submission of acceptable certificates from accredited secondary schools and colleges, without mental examination, in accordance with the entrance regulations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM D. LEAHY,
Chief of Bureau.

(Enc.)

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, the Government has committed itself to a naval policy. We are committed to building a Navy up to treaty strength. This bill provides for such appropriations as are now necessary to carry out that established policy of the Government. If we are going to build additional ships, if we are going to increase the Navy as we have been doing for the past year or two and continue to do so until we build up to treaty strength, it is an untenable position to favor the building of a lot of ships and oppose the provision of the officers required to man those ships.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is it not a fact that the gentleman himself cut down certain appropriations with the idea that there may be some limitation of armament; and inasmuch as that is in the air, it seems to me we do not necessarily have to pass this provision at this time, because we do not know how large the Navy is going to be 4 years from now?

Mr. CARY. Irrespective of the committee's action with respect to appropriations for shipbuilding, it is my judgment that this additional appointment is justified at this time. The House, as recently as March 27 last, expressed itself upon the need for additional officers in passing H. R. 5599, which looks to increasing the line-officer strength of the Navy to 6,531 by 1945. We are told, and I think it is true, that it will not be practicable to reach that number with three appointments, considering past experience of attrition from normal causes in conjunction with increased forced attrition incident to the legislation passed at the last session.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It would be useless to authorize the construction of ships unless we provided for the officers to man the ships.

Mr. CARY. Manifestly, that is true.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Presuming that the naval conference which is in the air decided on a decrease in naval armament, will this provision that we have to appoint four cadets from each congressional district still hold?

Mr. CARY. We can control that each year. That can be controlled by limitation in this bill from year to year.

I hope the members of the Committee will defeat this amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] evidently goes on the theory that you can train a naval officer as readily as you can an infantry officer. A battleship is a highly technical proposition and you cannot send a young man into an officers' training camp for a few months and have him come out equipped, trained, and ready to take such command.

There is another angle to this proposal that the House should look into. Our aim should be to create one of the largest merchant marines in the world, and we should have the largest merchant marine of any country in the world.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. If the United States Government pursues the policy which the gentleman's party has sponsored for 70 years of a high protective tariff, what is this merchant marine going to haul?

Mr. KNUTSON. Some one always likes to drag a red herring across the trail.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is a pretty good one, though. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. I will admit that if you continue your processing tax on cotton we probably will not need any merchant marine or, at least, not much of a one, but I am assuming that the American people will return to sanity sooner or later and return the Republican Party to power, and when they do we are going to need a very considerable merchant marine.

Mr. SISSON, Mr. BIERMANN, and Mr. MAVERICK rose.

Mr. KNUTSON. No! I cannot be interrupted now, because I have only a few minutes.

Even though we do not commission these additional graduates they will nevertheless be available in time of crisis. They will be available in the building up of our merchant marine, and I consider that one of the best investments contained in this appropriation bill.

I am not in favor of a great big Navy, but I do believe that we should have trained personnel that will be available overnight, if a crisis should arise and it should become necessary for us to fight for our lives on the high seas.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As I understand it, the cadets that come out of the Naval Academy are prepared largely for official duty and the gentleman will remember that the War Department reports show that our greatest difficulty when we entered the World War was lack of trained officers on land and sea.

Mr. KNUTSON. We took care of the situation very nicely on land, although it slowed up the prosecution of the war to establish training camps and run the students through them, but you cannot do that with respect to the Navy.

You talk about taking a boy out of the Boston School of Technology and giving him 6 months and then placing a battleship in his hands. Why, that is too absurd even to discuss seriously.

A battleship costs 45 or 50 million dollars. There are something like two or three thousand men whose lives are absolutely in the hands of the officers of that ship. Even after 4 years an Annapolis graduate has to be given practical and protracted instructions on the high seas before he is qualified to take command of a vessel. When they talk about availing ourselves of graduates of the Boston School of Technology, that is all poppycock. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I do not claim to know how many naval cadets we need. I am not sure that any Member of the House knows how many naval cadets we need. I do recall that 2 years ago a bill was introduced in this House to give a large percentage of these graduates from the Naval Academy at Annapolis a degree, because there was no place for them in the Navy. They could not receive a commission on graduation. I voted for that bill because I thought it a fair proposition that as long as they had spent 4 years of their lives in the Academy, and there was no place for them in the Navy, we should give them what little help we could to enable them to earn a living in industry.

After that we engaged in this bigger Navy building proposition. We had more men than ships then, and now they say we will have more ships than men.

I understood the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in making his argument for this proposition for spending \$457,000,000, to say something to the effect that this Government owed it to our citizens, to our nationals, to protect them and their property wherever they are.

I say that is not the policy of this administration, it is not the policy of the Government, it is not the policy of the

Department of State, and, God willing, it will never be their policy. [Applause.]

It is that imperialistic policy which has brought on wars. I will never vote to send my boy or any other boy of anyone on the floor to fight the battles of the Rockefellers or the great oil interests. [Applause.]

We are trying to avoid foreign entanglements and keep ourselves out of foreign wars. The one thing I am praying for is that our business men, our oil interests, our commercial interests, will not be able to embroil us, but that we will keep our citizens off the seas in time of war.

In time of war the only thing to do is to win the war. They forget all rules of international law. England, whose colonies are all around the world, and upon whose territory the sun never sets, has spent 20 percent less in the last 13 years on her navy than we have spent on ours, and we are now building a Navy that is going to be, in the language of its advocates—even Assistant Secretary Roosevelt—even a greater brandisher of the big stick than in the days of his distinguished kinsman, the late Theodore—a Navy second to none. We are building a Navy to protect us against whom? Not one man comes here and points out why we need a larger Navy for defensive purposes. We are more advantageously situated than any other country in the world, and we are doing less to promote peace than the other great powers. We are not doing our part. I am in favor of cutting down the appropriations in this bill at least 25 percent. I understand from press reports—and I do not know how authentic they are—that there was considerable feeling in this subcommittee that this amount ought to be much further reduced. I am not a member of the committee, and I am not authorized to speak for them. I think they have brought in as good a bill as they could under the circumstances, and I think they brought in a fine report, and I want to go along with them. I am for a navy adequate for defense, but I would like to see the amount of this bill reduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Page 29, line 22, after the word "Commissioner", insert the following: "and of one midshipman from the Panama Canal Zone appointed on the nomination of the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I understand that we have a very representative citizenship among our residents in the Panama Canal Zone. The young men of that zone have very great difficulty in arranging to even be considered for the Military Academy at West Point or the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The amendment which I have offered speaks for itself. The Governor of the Canal Zone is well qualified to use proper discretion in selecting young men of the Canal Zone, for which we are responsible. I think it ought to have representation in the appointment of at least one midshipman at the Naval Academy.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. This provision is a limitation upon existing law and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] any authorization of law for such an amendment?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAINTENANCE, BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

For equipage, supplies, and services under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, including stationery for commanding, executive, communication, and navigating officers of ships, boards and courts on ships, and chaplains; commissions, interest, and exchange; ferrriage and bridge tolls, including street-

car fares; rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards, except for use of naval attachés and recruiting officers; accident prevention; services of civilian employees under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; freight, express, and parcel-post charges, including transportation of funds and cost of insurance on shipments of money when necessary, and ice for cooling drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals and shops at industrial navy yards), pertaining to the Navy Department and Naval Establishment, \$8,300,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of the supply or replacement of table linen, dishes, glassware, silver, and/or kitchen utensils for use in the residences or quarters of officers on shore: *Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any expense for or incident to the transportation of privately owned automobiles except on account of the return to the United States of such privately owned automobiles as may have been transported to points outside of the continental limits of the United States at public expense prior to July 1, 1932: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$4,400,000: *Provided further*, That, without deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and withdrawal on money requisitions, receipts of public moneys from sales or other sources by officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on disbursing duty and charged in their official accounts may be used by them as required for current expenditures, all necessary bookkeeping adjustments of appropriations, funds, and accounts to be made in the settlement of their disbursing accounts.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If it were in order at this time, I would offer an amendment that the bill include an appropriation of at least \$6,000,000 for the construction of an all-metal lighter-than-air ship.

I want to discuss very briefly the question of continuing the development of lighter-than-air craft. While it is my purpose primarily to discuss metal-clad airship construction, I want to point out that I am of the opinion that the Government of the United States should continue to experiment with the Zeppelin type of rigid airship covered with fabric.

In the year 1921 a group of Detroit men associated principally in the automobile industry came to the conclusion that the successful rigid airship of the future would be built entirely of metal, even including the hull itself. Quiet though careful engineering investigation of the possibilities of metal-clad construction convinced this enterprising group that metal-clad construction was not only feasible but wholly practical.

In 1926 the technical problems had been mastered to a sufficient degree of certainty to justify the construction of the prototype, an all-metal craft of 200,000 cubic feet displacement, which is known as the "ZMC-2", and which is in active service of the Navy today.

I want to say to the Members of the House that the year of 1929 in the field of lighter-than-air ship construction was as revolutionary in development as the year 1834 when the first iron steamship was built at Savannah.

On August 19 of the memorable year of 1929 the skeptics the world over were convinced of the airworthiness and practicability of this unusual craft. The ZMC-2 had been successfully flown from its hangar at the Grosse Ile Airport, Detroit, after most rigid and thorough tests. The acceptance of the ship by the Navy Department was predicated upon the test flight of 600 miles nonstop from Detroit to Lakehurst, N. J. She was then placed in the hands of the naval experts to complete their own tests with the "tin blimp", and it is significant that the ZMC-2 met every requirement of the naval contract with a safe margin over requirements, and today, nearly 6 years after her first flight, I am informed by the Navy Department that this all-metal ship is in active service, in perfect unimpaired condition. She has worn out two sets of motors and her third set will have to be replaced shortly.

This revolutionary type, revolutionary in the sense, however, in that it is an original model, had made a total of 278 flights as of October 1, 1933. At that time she had had 1,016 hours in the air and a mileage estimated above 50,000 miles, or twice the distance around the world. She had been flown in all kinds of weather and had met every test of the Navy Department thus far. It is safe to assume that

her mileage and number of hours in the air has been increased since that time by at least 50 percent. This craft is unusually stable and airworthy. The retention of helium gas surpasses the requirements of the experts of the Navy Department. The only diffusion of gas is through the gas valves when they are in need of reseating.

On April 12 of 1933 the Bureau of Standards made tests of six samples of the metal hull plating. The tests indicate no loss in strength nor presence of crystalline corrosion. This Alclad plating, which is now over 7 years old, still exceeds in strength the original contract specifications. I submit for the RECORD the figures of the Bureau of Standards:

	Ultimate tensile	
Strength (pounds per inch ²)	50,000	57,700
Yield point (pounds per inch ²)	28,000	39,700
Elongation	12	16.5

It is now generally admitted in aeronautical circles that the metal-clad ZMC-2 can no longer be regarded as an experiment. Quite the contrary, it is admitted that in the very first attempt in all-metal construction the designers evolved and completed a proven success.

The Metalclad Airship Corporation, of Detroit, enlisted the scientific cooperation and aid of the different departments of the United States Government, a number of nationally known engineers and experts connected with educational and industrial enterprises of this country. Among these I list the following:

- United States Navy, Bureau of Aeronautics.
- United States Army Air Corps.
- National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
- Bureau of Standards.
- Prof. Herbert C. Sadler and Ralph H. Upson, of the University of Michigan.
- Dr. William Hovgaard, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Dr. R. A. Millikan, of the California Institute of Technology.
- William B. Mayo, formerly chief engineer for the Ford Motor Co.
- C. F. Kettering, president of General Motors Research Corporation.

Alex Dow, president of the Detroit Edison Co.
 Dr. E. Blough, Aluminum Co. of America.
 Extensive study of lighter-than-air ships necessarily leads to but one conclusion. That is, that in order to be successful, this type of ship must meet the demands of commerce with speed in excess of 100 miles per hour. The metal-clad type is eminently suited to fulfill this demand.

Perhaps the supreme advantage of the metal-clad is its ability to develop adequate strength and high speed without any serious loss of efficiency from a pay-load carrying standpoint.

I want to cite some of the numerous advantages which the metal-clad ship enjoys over other types of lighter-than-air craft:

- Simplicity of design and construction.
- No indeterminate hull stresses.
- Fireproofness.
- Durability of plating.
- Superior gastightness.
- Ease of maintenance and inspection of hull.
- Rigidity of hull shape at high speeds.
- Greater gas volume for the same air displacement.
- No moisture absorption.
- No loss of speed due to flapping fabric.
- Superiority at high speed.
- No deterioration under tropical sun.
- Ability to increase strength by higher pressure, yet rigid enough to fly with atmospheric pressure.
- Wider range of inside pressure variation.
- Perfect electric bonding of all structural parts.
- Economy in operation.
- Weatherproof qualities.
- Commercial safety.
- Adaptability to outside mooring at terminals.

Of the advantages cited above it appears that the most important to commercial operations are, first, inherent safety and, second, ability to operate continuously at high speeds in the region of 100 miles or more per hour. These advantages are due to—

- Improved principles of design.
- Choice of materials.
- Integrity of hull structure.
- Method of operation.

Eminent men the world over have expressed themselves very favorably as regards all metal construction in airships. The performance of the ZMC-2 has furnished proof for the most critical observer. It is interesting to note the expression of Rear Admiral E. J. King. Under date of September 13, 1933, he states:

The way that ship (ZMC-2) has been performing is rather surprising; little has been found wrong with her. If I had to choose between a sister ship to the *Macon* and a metal clad, I think I would take the metal clad. We have done all we can with the fabric-covered dirigible.

Admiral King's interview is based on his observation of the performance of the first and only ship of its kind which was completed before the *Akron* or the *Macon* was laid down. The ZMC-2 continues to fly long after the tragic loss of these two leviathans of the air, and according to all reports will continue for a long time to come.

Such outstanding world experts as Maj. G. Herbert Scott, of England, Sir Dennistoun Burney, Col. V. C. Richmond, William B. Mayo, and C. F. Kettering, who is director of the International Zeppelin Corporation, are unanimous in the expression that the metal sheeting used in the construction of the ZMC-2 is superior to the fabric-covered ship.

In the opinion of Ralph H. Upson, aeronautical engineer of the University of Michigan, a metal-clad ship of about 3,000,000 cubic feet, which is less than one-half of the 7,400,000 cubic feet of the *Akron*, would have a performance and general utility for naval purposes in many respects greater than that of the *Akron* or the *Macon*.

Dr. William Hovgaard, professor of naval design and construction at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and consulting engineer of the United States Navy, states that the more he studies the metal-clad airship the better he likes it. He states:

The principal difference between the metal-clad airship and the Zeppelin consists in the fitting of a thin gas-tight metal skin, which is riveted to the structure and which takes the place of the outer cover, the wire and cord netting, the gas-tight fabric, and the diagonal wires in the Zeppelin. The metal plating may be regarded as the principal strength member of the hull, and serves at the same time as a gas container. It excels by its simplicity, its superior strength, and its gas-tightness.

The metallic skin, in conjunction with the rigid main frames and a high gas pressure, insure a maintenance of form not obtainable in Zeppelins, where the diagonals permit very great shearing deflections. The fact that its high internal pressure can be safely maintained is one of the most important advantages of the metal-clad airship. Associated with a rigid structure, the metal skin places this type of airship in a class by itself, superior in strength and stiffness to all former rigid and nonrigid airships.

Dr. Herbert C. Sadler, dean of engineering, University of Michigan, has this to say:

It is a matter of common knowledge that a circular-shaped structure with metal disposed on the circumference is the lightest form from the strength point of view, and metal containers for holding gases are by no means new; so the question can be carried a step further from the more theoretical aspect of "Should it be done?" to the form of "Can it be done?"

Here begins the cooperation of the scientist, engineer, and metallurgist in carrying out the necessary designs, investigations, and experimental research work to cover each and all of the details that may be involved in the problem. Today, with the development of such processes, the chances of failure are reduced to a minimum as compared with the rule-of-thumb methods.

The present status of the metal-clad airship is a good illustration of the foregoing. Years of patient research, theoretical investigations, numerous types of design and details were undertaken before the ZMC-2 was built.

Although the very small size of this vessel introduced additional factors which made the problem more difficult of solution than that of a larger vessel, the result has proved that the fundamental conceptions are sound and that such ships are practicable. The ZMC-2 may therefore be regarded as proof that certain elements on which there might have been some doubts have been dispelled. The strength of the structure, its ability to hold gas, its practicable

operation as an aircraft, and, so far as can be seen at present, its durability have been demonstrated.

The next step, namely, the proposal to build a large vessel of a really practical size for useful work in either the military or commercial field, will naturally involve carrying the designs, investigations, and research work to further stages.

While with the ZMC-2 a number of men were willing to spend their time and money on the development of ideas in which they had faith and which subsequent events proved to be correct, it would seem not only proper but almost the duty of the Government of the United States to foster further developments in this new form of transportation.

Dr. Walter Bleistein, consulting aeronautical engineer of Berlin, Germany, has the following to say about the metal-clad airship:

In 1897 David Schwarz built an aluminum-covered airship in Berlin. Its power plant failed on its first test flight and the airship was dismantled by souvenir hunters. Because of the non-availability at that time of suitable sheet metal of a thickness required for the hull plating, airship designers in Germany then turned to the principles of the free balloon, using fabric as a covering.

However, it is most welcome news that the United States Navy ZMC-2 has demonstrated such excellent possibilities for building and operating metal-clad airships. When American experience is available to our German airship works, then we shall once again turn to the building of metal-clad airships.

Expressions of absolute approval of the metal-clad ships have been made by experts and observers the world over, and are too numerous to mention in the short space of time allotted to me.

I have introduced a bill which will serve the Naval Committee as a basis for its consideration, and I hope that within a short time this group of very able and earnest Members will report favorably a bill based upon the advice of experts, so that the Government of the United States can proceed with the construction of a ship of suitable size to bring to America the laurels in the field of lighter-than-air aviation. It is my belief that the advice of C. F. Kettering should be taken into consideration by the committee. He is of the opinion that an all-metal dirigible of 100 tons, or about eight times the ZMC-2, is entirely practical at this time. He contends that the specialists in lighter-than-air research definitely worked out the problem of all-metal airships. He predicts rapid extension of this type of ship in the field of naval, military, and commercial service.

I read for your edification an interesting naval press release, under date of August 19, 1934:

Today marks the fifth anniversary of the launching of the Navy's metal clad ZMC-2 at the Grosse Ile Airport, Detroit, Mich.

During this period of time the ZMC-2 has been almost continuously in operation as a training and experimental ship assigned to the United States Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J. She has flown approximately 50,000 miles during her 1,100 hours in the air.

Built by the Metalclad Airship Corporation of Detroit, Mich., the ZMC-2 is the first successful airship with the hull, including the hull covering itself, built entirely of metal.

In 1922 a group of Detroit men identified principally with the automotive industry turned their attention toward the possibility of constructing airships with all-metal hulls, a step that seemed obviously desirable. Considerable experimentation and research were carried on, and 4 years later Congress was asked for an appropriation, later granted, to defray the cost of building a small experimental unit. Many new problems arose during the actual construction of the ZMC-2, but they were successfully solved by the engineering staff of the builders with the support and encouragement of the Navy Department's own engineers.

At that time a great deal of skepticism prevailed as to the success of the venture. Gas tightness of seams and durability of the very thin metal required for the hull covering were moot questions.

"Alclad", a strong aluminum alloy, now in general use in all types of aircraft construction, was employed commercially for the first time in the building of the ZMC-2.

The Federal Government at the present time is working diligently on a plan to expend \$4,800,000,000 to break the back of the depression. Here, in my estimation, is an opportunity for the Federal Government to undertake the construction of one or more metal-clad airships. Experts for this type of construction could be gainfully employed for the period of the next 2 years, and in a sense this assembly of pioneer builders would be a valuable reserve of the armed forces of this country.

In conclusion let me state that the Metalclad Airship Corporation was so firmly convinced that the tin blimp would fly that they agreed to build the first ship for the Navy at

a cost of \$300,000. The actual cost of the completed ship, however, was more than \$750,000. The total development and research work plus the cost of the ship was upward of a million and a quarter.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mrs. KAHN. How many ships of that type has the Navy in use now?

Mr. DINGELL. Only one, the ZMC-2, the original and only ship of its kind in the world.

Mrs. KAHN. I had an idea that there were at least two.

Mr. DINGELL. No; only one. We should build one at least 10 to 15 times as large, because the ZMC-2 is only of 200,000 cubic feet capacity. The ship should be of somewhere near 3,000,000 cubic feet capacity to be of proper experimental size. The *Macon* was, as you will remember, of 7,400,000 cubic feet capacity.

Mrs. KAHN. I remember at one time there was a bill before the Committee on Military Affairs for its consideration to authorize an appropriation to build one for the use of the Army. I do not remember just how far that proceeded, but I know the Navy had one, and I thought it had two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested here during the debates on this bill making appropriations for a Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, that there will not be a record vote of this House upon this bill. Anticipating that such may be the case, it is therefore necessary to take this means to register my views in regard to this bill.

There are some things in relation to the Government of this country that I understand, and there are some things in regard to the operation of the Government that I do not understand. I understand that according to article 1, section 1 of the Constitution of the United States all legislative powers therein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives, and therefore it is not only the duty of Congress to pass the necessary legislation in connection with the operation of this Government, but the responsibility for such legislation that is passed rests upon this same body. I further understand that according to section 8 of article 1 that Congress shall have power to provide and maintain a navy, and therefore, according to my understanding, it is the duty and obligation of Congress to provide and maintain an adequate Navy; and that, of course, would include the providing of sufficient appropriations for such purpose.

We are all familiar with the age-old proverb, as old as the human race, namely, "Consistency, thou art a jewel"; and it seems to me if this proverb was ever true it is more true today than ever before. Now, the things that I cannot understand are, in view of the recent statement of Mr. Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury, and others, declaring that the credit of the United States would be periled by the payment of what is commonly known as the "soldiers' bonus", which would amount, if paid out in cash by the Treasury of the United States at this time, to a little better than \$2,000,000,000; in view of the representations made to us when the old-age pension bill, known as the "social security bill", was considered by Congress last week, that to adopt any other plan, other than the plan presented appropriating \$49,750,000 for old-age pensions, would become extremely burdensome in future years; and in view of the fact that the second bill passed by the Seventy-third Congress was what was known as the "economy bill", and in regard to which I might say I cast the only vote from Kansas in the House against such bill, and Senator McGILL the only vote from Kansas in the Senate against this bill, and all pay cuts provided therein having now been restored, and practically every other economy eliminated except the cuts made in reference to our veterans, now leaving all the economy in this bill resting upon them practically alone, and

whereas there was introduced in the Senate last week a bill known as the "Harrison bill", which was introduced, as I understand it, as a compromise bonus bill, which, I understand, specifically provides that it would be in lieu of all future pensions due to the World War veterans, notwithstanding the fact when the adjusted-service certificate was given the veteran by the Government it was generally understood that it was in lieu of back pay, notwithstanding the fact that this country has always provided pensions for those who served their country, and in view of such fact such provision would be an insult and a slur at the veterans; and whereas this Government has spent over \$13,000,000,000 on our armies and navies, all of which has been called "preparedness", from 1920 to and including 1935; and whereas in addition to all this thirteen billions heretofore provided for preparedness this session of Congress is appropriating over \$1,000,000,000 for such purpose; therefore, to sum up, I cannot understand how this country could have spent over \$13,000,000,000 from 1920 to and including 1935 on preparedness and are appropriating over a billion dollars in this bill without the credit of the United States being periled thereby, but to restore to the veterans what was taken away from them in the economy act to pay the soldiers' bonus, and which, by the way, if paid by the bill passed by the House, known as "H. R. 1", or the "Patman bill", would not cost the Government anything but will save it a considerable sum in addition to helping business in general—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER] has expired.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. CARPENTER. How the appropriation of a larger amount for old-age pensions, which would give the old people a more generous pension in keeping with what they have been led to expect, would imperil the credit of this country and bankrupt it, as we have been told from time to time—

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. The gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand I can speak on anything involved in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CARPENTER. In other words if we can spend all these billions of dollars for warfare when we have no war, a great percentage of which is a total waste, then to be consistent it seems to me that we could pay the soldiers' bonus, if that was desired, in actual cash, whereas, as a matter of fact that is not necessary as is provided in the Patman bill and provide a greater and more generous old-age pension.

While I appreciate it is natural for Members of Congress to support projects that involve their districts, in connection with our military preparedness, I have done and would do the same thing, for I realize they are desirous of obtaining such projects because of the amount of work that will be provided by the same, and that is about all the consolation we can get out of such appropriations that they will provide some small measure of work and relief in our various districts.

What is the necessity for having such a large Navy anyway? We have no foreign possessions to protect that require such a large Navy, especially when we have given up the Philippines. We have no foreign trade left to protect. Public opinion in this country is unalterably opposed to our participating in any foreign war, and such sentiment has been recently included in a bill, the McSwain bill, which passed the House a few days ago, prohibiting this country from sending its armed forces upon foreign soil, except only as may be necessary to prevent or repel actual invasion of this country. Therefore, I can see no other reason or necessity for such a large Navy, except just to see it pass in review.

It has always generally been the result that whenever any country created large military forces and a large navy that

it invariably ended up in a war. We cannot have these large military forces and wars without veterans of wars. Instead of looking to create veterans of future wars, we should be more interested in looking after the veterans of our past wars; and I say here again, as I said when the economy bill was discussed before this body, "May God forbid that the veteran is to become the 'forgotten man' and the real governmental economy that was promised be lost sight of."

In addition thereto, every cent of money that we spend upon preparedness that is not necessary makes it just that much more impossible to ever collect the war debt that the European countries already owe us, for the reason that every time we unnecessarily increase our military activities that causes them to do likewise and to spend money on armies and navies instead of paying their just debts to us.

Now, while I would be willing to vote for the necessary appropriations for our national defense, if it is so necessary that we have economy—and I believe it is—I could not vote for the appropriation provided in this and like bills, and therefore I wish as completely as I can to register my vote against this bill containing the amount of appropriations that it does. [Applause.]

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, at this time when we are considering the largest Navy appropriation that has ever been presented in peace times to the Congress of the United States, it is well worth while to see how the other nations are looking at this gesture.

In this morning's Washington Post there appears a news item by the United Press, which reads as follows:

JAPANESE PLAY UNITED STATES MOCK WAR AS AGGRESSION—ARTICLE CITES "EVIDENCE" OF WIDE PROGRAM FOR DRIVE ON FAR EAST

TOKYO, April 26.—Pending maneuvers of the United States fleet are aimed at Japan's mandated islands in the Pacific and form part of a program for a campaign against the Far East, the newspaper Nichi Nichi charged today in a sensational article credited to the Japanese Navy's interpretation of Washington's naval attitude.

"The maneuvers constitute training for crossing the Pacific", the article said.

"In establishing submarine and air bases in the Aleutian Islands and practicing defense and attack, America aims at a campaign plan against the mandated islands in the South Seas, thus swinging the position of their objective 90 degrees from south to north."

"The United States is undertaking a trans-Pacific air route under the pretext of civil aviation. The airways bears a great strategic significance, exposing to the whole world their aggressive naval plans against the Far East."

"In recalling the flagship *Augusta* and including it in the circular formation, the United States Navy was dictated to by a real need for it."

The *Augusta*, heavy cruiser, which has been flagship of the Asiatic Fleet, has been ordered to participate in the maneuvers and will be replaced as flagship by the light cruiser *Omaha* in the fall.

The Nichi Nichi article continued:

"In appropriating \$300,000 for Pearl Harbor repairs, America seeks to strengthen her post as an important base for an advance across the Pacific. America's planned construction of 555 naval planes and increasing of officers to 8,176 are all part of her preparations for a far-eastern campaign."

"Reduction of the naval construction budget in Congress does not necessarily constitute reduction of her naval program, but is a reflection of opinion at home for emphasis on disarmament and can well be counterbalanced by its revival next year or another appropriate measure to fulfill the original plan."

"The American Navy is maintaining world naval supremacy by carrying out trans-Pacific naval operations despite the fact that a disarmament conference looms."

Nichi Nichi credited the Foreign Office with the viewpoint that "a note of despair reportedly struck in American official circles over the disarmament conference is regarded at the Foreign Office as propaganda started by the American Navy, aimed at making their claim on the budget effective." The article concluded:

"Officials in the Foreign Office are entertaining a disagreeable feeling regarding America's aggressive naval maneuvers, but Japan is withholding expression of her attitude for the conference pending British initiative. Japan, however, absolutely opposes postponement on such a vague pretext as the European situation."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LUCKEY] has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 29 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. I offer an amendment which is at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL: Page 29, line 22, after the semicolon, insert "and one midshipman from each of the military schools to be chosen as follows to-wit: the Secretary of the Navy may approve a list known as honor schools in a number not exceeding 25."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislative matter attempting to be placed in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] whether or not there is any authorization in law for such an appropriation?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, on line 14, page 29, there starts a limitation to the general terms of the bill. It reads:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman whose admission subsequent to January 30, 1935, would result in exceeding at any time the allowance of four midshipmen by each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress—

And so on. In other words, that is a limitation. The amendment which I propose is a perfecting amendment to that limitation. It is not legislative in its character.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again ask the gentleman if he has any knowledge of any authorization in law which will permit of such appropriation, aside from what he has read, which, as the Chair understands, is covered by existing law?

Mr. BELL. This amendment does not seek an appropriation. It is simply placing an additional limitation among the limitations which start with line 14 and end at the bottom of the page.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCormack). The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLOTHING, NAVAL RESERVE

The clothing and small-stores fund shall be charged with the value of all issues of clothing and small stores made to aviation cadets and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and the uniform gratuity paid to officers of the Naval Reserve.

Mr. BIERMANN. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on several occasions the opponents of this bill have asked its advocates to tell us against whom we are preparing and for what this huge expenditure is intended. Up to this time they have not told us. I renew the request, but I have no idea they will tell us during the remainder of this debate.

Mr. CARY. Will the gentleman suffer an interruption?

Mr. BIERMANN. Certainly.

Mr. CARY. The gentleman has repeatedly asked the House to tell him against what nation we are preparing this Navy. When the Constitution of the United States provided that we have a Navy, will the gentleman tell the House against what country the framers of the Constitution expected that Navy to be used?

Mr. BIERMANN. If the time ever arrives when the Constitution of the United States is a subject for legislation before this body, I will give my opinion on that subject. At the present time we are considering the naval appropriation bill. A recent Associated Press report states that the House of Commons recently passed an appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the Navy of Great Britain. Surely all the Members of this House will agree that Great Britain has more reason to have a large navy than the United States of America, yet we are asked to appropriate \$457,000,000 for our Navy. This money is not coming out of the air. I hope it is not coming out of printing-press money. It is coming out of the taxpayers of the United States.

We have heard during this discussion some reference to other purposes to which this money could be devoted. In the United States there are 123 colleges and universities that

have endowments in excess of \$2,000,000. Some of those institutions are 100, 200, and one of them is nearly 300 years old. The total endowments of all those institutions is approximately \$1,199,000,000.

If we subtract from that sum the endowment of Harvard University, we shall arrive at a figure that is less than twice what it will cost to maintain this Navy for 1 year. In other words, when our Navy reaches treaty strength, according to the testimony of Admiral Standley, it is going to cost us \$555,000,000 a year to maintain it. Stated in another way, we are going to pay every 2 years to support this "treaty strength" Navy as much money as is represented by the endowments of all the colleges and universities in the United States, except Harvard, that have as much endowment as \$2,000,000 each. In my district there are several small colleges—Luther College, Lenox College, and Upper Iowa University—all of which have done great work in educational fields. One of the graduates of Luther College just passed up this aisle, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE]. Any one of these colleges would be delighted with an endowment of \$500,000.

To maintain this Navy at treaty strength for 1 year we are going to spend as much money as it would take to endow for all time 1,110 colleges such as Luther, Upper Iowa, and Lenox, in the Fourth District of Iowa.

We have been talking considerably about good roads in this country, and we have appropriated a lot of money for roads. In the State of Iowa we think we have good roads; they are 18 feet wide, as a rule, and of concrete, and cost about \$20,000 a mile at the present time. I just made a calculation to the effect that this money we are going to spend for the maintenance of our Navy would build nine paved highways from Washington City to San Francisco, Calif.

I want the Members to take these figures into consideration before they vote for this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I really rose at this time to ask the gentleman from Nebraska if he is going to take the expression of a jingo Japanese press as the real idea of what the Navy Department of the United States is doing or what our naval policy is. I wonder if the gentleman realized when he read the article stating that Japan was protesting against the establishment of a commercial aviation line by the United States, just exactly what Japan herself is doing along the line of establishing commercial aviation lines? I would like to quote from one of the newspapers published in Washington, the Times, on April 23 regarding the establishment of commercial aviation lines by the Japanese Government. There is no one who does not realize that in case of trouble, whether it be between Japan and the United States, England, France, or some other nation, our commercial aviation lines are going to be one of our chief lines of defense.

The article reads as follows:

Japan has not waited until the eleventh hour to project an intensive development of commercial aviation in the vast area of the Pacific.

Before the American Congress even considered authorizing the negotiation of an air-mail contract for a 4-day air mail service between San Francisco and Manila, beginning with an overnight mail service between the American mainland and its main outpost of defense in the Pacific—the Hawaiian Islands—Japan's aviation program in the Pacific had been formulated and approved by the Government and announced to the Japanese people.

In the Japanese program the first part consists of the following specific projects for the development of commercial aviation in the Pacific:

JAPAN'S PROGRAM

First. A regular air mail service between Japan and Formosa—just across from the Philippine Islands. Test flights have already been made over this stretch from Japan proper toward the Philippines. These tests are said to have been highly successful. It is expected that the service will soon be inaugurated with a flight each way every week.

Second. A new air mail service between Japan proper and Korea. The terminals of this new air line will be Tokyo or Osaka, in Japan, and Tanan, in northern Korea.

The great advantage of this line will lie in the fact that it will result in a great saving in time between Tokyo, the capital city of Japan, and Tsinking, the capital city of Manchukuo, Japan's new "ally" and completely docile "neighbor"—theoretically an independent state, actually, according to the world point of view, a Japanese dependency.

Third. An air mail service between Tokyo and Parao, the administrative center of the mandated islands in the Pacific. To the United States was ceded by Germany a one-fifth share in the sovereignty of these islands, but their administration has been mandated by the League to Japan. This is not necessarily a permanent mandate.

The approval of the United States to the continuance of this mandate by Japan is necessary. The route from Japan for the projected air line to the islands would run via the Bonin Islands, concerning the fortifications of which there has long been much speculation.

Fourth. An air mail service between Tokyo and Sapporo, with stops planned at Sendai and Aomori.

Fifth. An air mail service between Tokyo and Kochi or Shikoku.

Sixth. An air mail service between Osaka and Matsue, Shimane Prefecture, on the Japan Sea.

Seventh. An air mail service between Osaka and Nagano, by way of Toyama on the Japan Sea.

Eighth. An air mail service between Tokyo and Niigata on the Japan Sea by way of Nagano. This would presumably supplant the summer service already provided by the Asahi Air Service Association.

What the Japanese are doing to develop commercial aviation in the vast area of the Pacific is in line with what the other great powers are also doing to the same end.

The British have an air line operating between the British Isles and Australia. Soon they propose to provide a connecting link with Hong Kong.

The Dutch are operating an air line from Amsterdam to Java and are projecting a link with Canton, China.

OVERNIGHT SERVICE

The French intend to provide a connecting link with Canton for their air line in operation between France and Indo-China.

If the present Congress gives its support to American aviation in the Pacific, there will before long be an overnight air mail service between San Francisco and Honolulu and later a 4-day daylight air service between there and Manila.

This is why a \$2,000,000 appropriation has been requested to enable the Federal Government to contract for air mail across the Pacific as soon as the Pan American trans-Pacific line begins to operate. The pioneer in this new conquest of the air, the Pan American Clipper, which has just completed its initial overnight flight between the American mainland and Hawaii, has blazed a new trail for all American commerce with the Far East.

With Japan surrounding the entire western Pacific area with air lines we certainly cannot take seriously the objection of Japan to the establishment of an all-American air line across the Pacific. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

AVIATION, NAVY

For aviation, as follows: For navigational, photographic, aerological, radio, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1935, \$498,200; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, air stations, fleet air bases, fleet and all other aviation activities, accident prevention, testing laboratories, for overhauling of planes, and for the purchase for aviation purposes only of special clothing, wearing apparel, and special equipment, \$10,755,150, including \$120,000 for the equipment of vessels with catapults and including not to exceed \$10,000 for the procurement of helium, which sum of \$10,000 shall be transferred to and made available to the Bureau of Mines on July 1, 1935, and the Bureau may lease, after competition, surplus metal cylinders acquired for use as helium containers; for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft, including the payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed, \$2,498,000; for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories, \$26,770,000, of which amount not to exceed \$8,500,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorizations carried in the Navy Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1934 and 1935, and \$17,475,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1937; in all, \$40,521,350; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "aviation" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,505,000: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Navy may, prior to July 1, 1937, enter into contracts for the production and pur-

chase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories, to an amount not in excess of \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, to transfer not to exceed in the aggregate \$24,000 from this appropriation to the appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", and "Pay, Marine Corps" to cover authorized traveling expenses of officers and enlisted men in connection with flying new airplanes from contractor's works to assigned station or ship, including travel to contractor's works and return of personnel to stations of duty, and the amount so transferred shall be in addition to any limitations contained in the appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy", and "Pay, Marine Corps": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coast of the continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$500.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 40, line 7, before the word "and", insert the following: "in addition to which sum the Bureau of Mines may use for helium-plant operation in the fiscal year 1936 the unexpended balance of the funds transferred to it for such operation in the fiscal year 1935."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I agree to the amendment; it ought to be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve (a) excluding transferred and assigned men, \$499,690; (b) transferred men, \$376,612; in all, \$876,302.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 6, strike out the sign and figures "\$499,690" and insert in lieu thereof "\$518,690"; and on page 44, line 7, strike out the sign and figures "\$376,302", which is a total, and insert in lieu thereof "\$895,302."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, in the bill as reported provision is made for securing 25 Marine Corps Reserve aviators out of the flying school at Pensacola, at a total cost of \$189,203. Since the bill has been reported it has been suggested to us that we provide instead for 25 aviation cadets, authorized by a bill approved the 15th of this month. At first blush I was opposed to the change, but the Marine Corps unquestionably is short of officer pilots and to meet that shortage would use Reserve officers on extended active-duty details. A Reserve officer costs more than an aviation cadet, so, looking ahead, I can see in the change a real saving. The difference approximates \$660 per annum in favor of the aviation cadet.

Apart from expense, morale at the flying school should have consideration. The student officer pilot takes his training as an enlisted man and the aviation cadet would be looked upon as a junior officer. There would be a difference in pay, a difference in rank, and of necessity a difference in the standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE IN THE NAVY

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, including (1) the expenses in connection with continuing the construction of 14 destroyers and 6 submarines which were commenced in the fiscal year 1935 under funds made available from the "Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935" and (2) for the commencement of 2 cruisers or subcategory (b) authorized by the act approved February 13, 1929 (45 Stat. 1165), and 1 aircraft carrier, 15 destroyers, and 6 submarines authorized by the act approved March 27, 1934 (48 Stat., pp. 503-505), \$88,310,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of the amount available for expenditure under the head

of "Construction and machinery" for the fiscal year 1936 for employees in the field service assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That of the appropriations contained in this act under the head of "Increase of the Navy", there shall be available such sums as the Secretary of the Navy may from time to time determine to be necessary for the engagement of technical services, and the employment of personnel in the Navy Department and in the field, the purchase of plans, drafting, and other supplies, and the expenses of printing and travel, in addition to those otherwise provided for, owing to the construction of vessels heretofore authorized and herein or heretofore appropriated for in part: *Provided further*, That the appropriation limitation on expenditures, including armor and armament, on vessels authorized on or prior to February 13, 1929, is hereby waived.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOPPLEMANN: Page 48, line 21, after the word "expended", insert "and no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the construction embraced by clause (2) prior to March 1, 1936."

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will in no sense destroy or change the purposes of the bill. The amendment is in line with a policy of this country that we do not increase our Navy any more than do those governments with which we have consulted and made definite agreements as to increase or decrease in the navies of the country which are parties to the agreement.

There will be a conference of these nations which ought and which I hope will come to an agreement before March 1, 1936. So that the money of the people of this country will not be uselessly spent, my amendment provides that the appropriation in this bill shall be available for construction after March 1, 1936. Surely, if this bill is passed today, and the body at the other end of the Capitol should pass it within a reasonable time, and the President should sign it, the time that will be consumed in the planning of these ships will take up to March 1, 1936, and there can be no harm in making certain that unnecessary expenditures of the people's money is made.

Back in 1921, just prior to the conference of 1922, America spent a great many millions of dollars on ships, which were afterwards scrapped. The disarmament conference of 1922 proved the necessity of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am further moved by the appeal which is carried in my amendment, because when the naval conference of 1935 convenes we ought to go into that conference with clean hands. We ought to go into that conference in the spirit of the good-neighbor policy. If we go before that conference with a big stick of a greatly increased Navy, should not we then create a spirit of antagonism amongst those with whom we are to confer? But if, on the other hand, we go into that conference as is indicated by my amendment, that we are holding up our program for an increased Navy, with the definite hope that the conference will prove a success and therefore we will not at this time definitely place ourselves in the position where we must increase our Navy, we not alone prove to the other nations of the world that we mean to be good neighbors but that we also prove to them that by our act we are good neighbors; that we mean that we are not having a great Navy, and that we hope for a reduction in the other navies of the world and not for more ships, and so prove ourselves honest in our endeavors for real and lasting peace. [Applause.]

As I understand it the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee had in effect in the bill they reported to the full committee, that which is carried in my amendment but for some reason the soundness of which I cannot comprehend, and which I believe was a great error, the full committee struck out the provision that the appropriation should not be made available for construction until March 1, 1936. On

page 3, I read in the report on this bill a most significant and important paragraph which I am calling to the attention of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I am reading now from the report on this bill.

"To create, maintain, and operate a Navy second to none and in conformity with treaty provisions," the fact remains that the present and ultimate annual cost must be disturbing to us and must be equally disquieting to other "treaty navy" powers. It would seem that continued limitation and some contraction of tonnages now permitted must be the wish of all educated, unselfish people the world over. Another conference will be held during the present calendar year. The committee's proposal to halve the estimate for additional new construction is offered with the thought that the administration might wish to defer the commencement of such construction until that conference shall have been concluded.

Those are the words of my amendment.

Such a course should be interpreted as an expression of our faith and confidence that the principle of limitation will survive and that out of such conference a new and better accord will be born. Holding up construction on the eve of another conference would be tangible proof of our wish and hope and faith that limitation will be continued and in some respects curtailed. Possibly, and perhaps very probably, a new agreement would not dispel the need to proceed with most if not all of the new construction the commencement of which it is proposed to defer, but there would appear to be no hazard in the delay and the course our action contemplates should challenge in a most effective way the attention of the peoples of those nations parties to the present naval limitation agreements and to the consequences if limitation be abandoned or even continued as now provided.

Mr. Chairman, I have just read from the report of the committee, which indicates that the committee is favorable to my amendment. I cannot understand why anyone should oppose this amendment. It is not comprehensible to me that any member of the committee or the "big stick" Naval Committee should oppose a reasonable waiting attitude.

The purpose of my amendment is that our country may be able to go before the nations of the world with clean hands. We are about to enter into a naval disarmament conference. How can we present an honest and sincere argument for disarmament and reduction of the navies of the world when we by our definite action of this Congress on the eve of the naval parley authorize untold millions of dollars more than ever before in the history of our country during peace times for an increased Navy?

In the light of the statement made by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress on January 4, 1935, in which he declared that "the people of most nations seek relief from the threat and the burden attaching to the false theory that extravagant armament cannot be reduced and limited by international accord."

Without my amendment as part of this bill I am very much afraid that the other nations which will be at this conference will look at us in wonderment at our duplicity and falseness to the principles laid down by the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we must not, we dare not, pass this bill without my amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KOPPLEMANN) there were—ayes 17, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

(Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 48, beginning in line 9, strike out the paragraph ending on page 49, line 17.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offered this motion to strike out the paragraph which provides additional funds for construction and machinery and which also provides specifically for the construction of additional ships, cruisers, submarines, and various other types of naval ships.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me in these troubled days it is inadvisable for the United States to engage in a program to

increase naval armament. We have heard a good deal of talk within the last few months about the possibilities of war, but I, for one, do not feel that there is any danger of this country becoming involved in a war unless we submit a challenge to the rest of the world or continue our ill-advised policy of increasing our armaments, and thereby challenge the world by serving notice on other nations that we are preparing ourselves for armed conflict.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. We tried disarmament by example. Does the gentleman think it was a success?

Mr. BOILEAU. I do not say that our Navy is inferior to the other navies of the world. There has been a tendency during the past several years and since the World War to reduce armaments. We have taken the lead in this respect. We have advocated that other nations reduce their armament. We have reduced ours. I do not think that we are in the position now of not being able to defend ourselves from any nation in the entire world. As a matter of fact, the Navy is not necessary in a defensive war.

We talk about our Navy being the first line of defense. I ask any Member of the House whether or not he can recall a single instance in modern history when this or any nation have landed troops on enemy soil. I know of none. I believe history will bear out the fact that troops are not landed on enemy soil by the navy. We should prepare to fight defensive wars only. If we do that, we will not have to worry about the superiority of anybody else's navy.

Mr. MAAS. May I ask the gentleman how the Japanese got over to China? Did they walk over?

Mr. BOILEAU. They did not land in Chinese territory.

Mr. MAAS. Yes they did.

Mr. BOILEAU. They did not land in China at all.

Mr. MAAS. In the case of our own country, they might land in Mexico and walk in.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am not afraid of enemy troops landing in Mexico, Canada, or any place else.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How about airplanes being carried over on battleships of other governments?

Mr. BOILEAU. By building up our Air Corps and our defensive armaments we can protect ourselves against any such possibilities.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How would the gentleman prevent those airplanes from landing in this country?

Mr. BOILEAU. If we are fearful of an attack from the air, then let us build up our air defense and not our naval defense.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How would the gentleman prevent airplane carriers carrying airplanes over here and then having the planes take the air about 100 miles out and landing?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. May I say to the gentleman from New York that if we are worried about airplanes landing over here, let us build up our air force and forget about the Navy, because the Navy cannot protect us from an air attack. What did the Navy do in the last war? Did we participate in any important or decisive naval battles during the last war?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. MAVERICK. For the gentleman's information, I may say that you can get from 500 to 1,000 airplanes for the cost of one battleship.

Mr. BOILEAU. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAVERICK. Does not the gentleman think that would be a better investment than one battleship?

Mr. BOILEAU. A great deal better.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Is it not a fact that during the World War our Navy convoyed our troops to Europe in 1917 and 1918?

Mr. BOILEAU. I was just waiting for some gentleman to make that statement. I knew somebody would make that statement because it is the only justification for a Navy—to escort convoys—and when our Navy escorts convoys that means we are fighting a foreign war and not a defensive war. [Applause.] That is the only justification for a Navy. The only justification in the world for a large Navy is that it gives us an opportunity to fight a war of aggression rather than a defensive war. This is why I say we should rely on our air forces from the standpoint of defense and not build up a huge Navy for aggression. I shall not vote for this bill, which increases the appropriations for naval construction, because it is a threat to the peace of the entire world, because it has only one purpose, and that is to make it possible for us to fight a foreign war and to assist our armed forces in a foreign war rather than in a domestic war.

During the World War the Navy did not accomplish anything except, as the gentleman from New Jersey has suggested, it gave protection to our troops going across the ocean on transports, or, at least, I presume it did. I recall that when I went overseas we saw a battleship as we left New York Harbor and we saw a battleship again when we got over to England. In the meantime we did not see it.

I suppose it was somewhere around there, and I presume it gave us some protection. I am not denying this; but we did not see it and were not sure that there was a battleship around to give us protection in case we needed it. However, we were told it was there; and when you are in the service, of course, you accept everything they tell you as gospel truth. I assume they were at hand ready to give us protection if we needed it.

However, I want to emphasize the fact that in my humble opinion the Navy is absolutely useless except for foreign wars and wars of aggression—in such wars they are of value. Someone might say that we have to have this huge Navy to protect the Philippine Islands and Hawaii. So far as the Philippines are concerned, they have shown quite conclusively they do not want our protection. They have shown conclusively that they want their independence, and we have voted to give them their independence, and I cannot see any justification for voting these huge sums of money to build up a Navy to protect the Philippine Islands. They are not in need of our protection, and they do not seem to want our protection. So far as Hawaii is concerned, I know of no country that is going over there and try to take Hawaii. I do not think it would be possible for any nation to do so; but if we are going to protect Hawaii against the possibility of some other country grabbing it, we should build up our armaments over there, fortify the islands, and do some further work along the line of defense. Personally, I believe the Hawaiian Islands are amply protected right now, because the Eleventh Field Artillery is stationed in the Hawaiian Islands. My opinion of the fighting qualities of the Eleventh Field Artillery may be somewhat partial because I happened to belong to that regiment during the World War.

Mr. MAAS. How about the marines?

Mr. BOILEAU. I did not happen to belong to the marines during the war, so I claim the Eleventh Field Artillery won the war.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Is it not a fact that in time of warfare on the sea, the maintenance of means of communication between ships is almost impossible and that ships have been known to fire upon one another when they were on the same side?

Mr. BOILEAU. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in that respect. I do not think they have developed the radio to the point where they can use it between ships with any degree of satisfaction. If they have developed it to the point where it can be used successfully in communicating with the various ships, I am quite sure that the other countries have not been asleep in this respect and that they have been able to develop a defense against such communications by creating a method to provide so much interference that such a means of communication would be useless

especially while engaged in battle. The old wig-wag system is useless now because they have to make a smoke screen to protect the ships from air attacks. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I cannot believe it will be seriously entertained.

We have a great many ships now under construction and if this money is not provided, it means doing the very thing that some Members on the floor of the House have been complaining about today, and that is, the scrapping of a lot of ships upon which construction already had been started.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARY. I yield.

Mr. McLEOD. Is it not a fact that the money provided in this bill under increase of the Navy, is not for additional ships, but for the replacement of ships?

Mr. CARY. Every bit of it is for replacement.

Mr. McLEOD. With no increase in the size of the Navy?

Mr. CARY. None at all.

Mr. McLEOD. But it means the replacing of obsolete ships.

Mr. CARY. That is it. We have much tonnage that is now overage and all of this program is intended partly to bring such tonnage underage.

Mr. McLEOD. Is it not also the fact that we are not building a war-strength navy, but we are building a peacetime strength, adequate navy?

Mr. CARY. That is what we are doing, we are building to a treaty-strength navy. We have started the program, and if you agree to this amendment it would interrupt the continuity of that program. We would not only interrupt it but close down the shipyards, both public and private, all over the country and add materially to the unemployment today and for months to come.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield? Would it not be better to take the money and use it for unemployment than to build ships of war? [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. It is being used for unemployment in building ships of war. I think we are committed to this program and we ought to stand up for it. The Government is committed to it, this Congress is committed to it, and if this amendment be agreed to it will about absolutely destroy the whole program.

Mr. BOILEAU. The purpose of this is to increase the strength of the Navy.

Mr. CARY. It is to build up to treaty strength.

Mr. BOILEAU. But it increases the strength of the Navy.

Mr. CARY. Certainly. The gentleman from Wisconsin is in favor of aircraft. If your amendment should be adopted, it would mean striking out money for building aircraft carriers that would be employed to protect the country.

Mr. BOILEAU. The aircraft carriers are part of the machinery of war on the high seas. What good is an aircraft carrier a hundred miles away for the purpose of protecting our country?

Mr. CARY. It would be of very great value in intercepting and attacking enemy aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KENNEY. My parliamentary inquiry is, Has all debate on this paragraph been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on the amendment has been exhausted. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU) there were 20 ayes and 92 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriations made in this act for the purchase or manufacture of equipment or material or of a particular class of equipment or material shall be available for the purchase of letters

patent, applications for letters patent, licenses under letters patent, and applications for letters patent that pertain to such equipment or material for which the appropriations are made.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, the organization for the expenditure of the \$4,880,000,000 appropriation for the re-employment of those unemployed and on relief and for the alleviation of distress brought about by the depression has been announced and is being carried forward. Many thousands of people will be employed to administer the expenditure of this money. The newspapers this week have spoken of the embarrassment that may be created by lack of housing facilities for the many thousands of employees who are coming to Washington. In every State and locality in the Union there will be employed thousands and thousands of people in clerical and supervisory and other capacities to take care of the expenditure of this money. It is of interest to those who desire such employment and are qualified and fitted for it to know how the choice is to be made. In that connection, I have before me a letter written to an applicant for supervisory work in one of these alphabetical agencies, which indicates the general system to be employed in building up the organizations both here in Washington and throughout the land to do this work and to spend this money, to supervise and come in contact with those who are relieved. This letter is written by an official in the Emergency Civil Works to an applicant from New Jersey for supervisory work in the C. C. C. Division of the Emergency Civil Works. He says in the letter they do not consider anyone—

Unless his name is certified to us on the so-called "advisers' list" from Washington. This is a list of names submitted by Senator MOORE—

And this is a letter written to a Jersey man—

Submitted by Senator MOORE and the Democratic Representatives in Congress from New Jersey to the Federal administration for employment in this C. C. C. activity. The only way in which you can put yourself in a position to secure such employment—

And that goes for all emergency agencies—

therefore, is by making arrangements to have Senator MOORE or one of the Democratic Congressmen request that your name be put on this "advisers' list."

Mr. Chairman, the organization for the 1936 election, which is to be financed by the \$4,880,000,000, is being set up. The key men are certified from the Democratic lists. They will have the spending of the money and the employment of those men on relief, and they will tell them, as they did in 1932, "Unless you vote the Democratic ticket, this money will cease."

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I made an effort to get the floor for a few minutes, merely to propound a question to our friend the eloquent statesman from Ohio, Mr. TRUAX. He declined to yield. He had previously declined to yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. Of course, having declined to yield to her, it was presumptuous for me to have any hope of getting consent from him to reply to my interrogatory. The singular circumstance happened to be that while he refused two Republican Members to be interrogated, he was talking on Republican time. At the close of the session, when I wanted 5 minutes I could not get it. So we have paradoxes and travesties of all kinds, even in a great body of men like this. I cannot understand my friend from Ohio, Mr. TRUAX. He should have been more friendly than that, particularly, I think, when I realize his mastery of the history of this country and of all countries, and that there came to his

section of Ohio in the early days that noble Indian fighter, Mad Anthony Wayne, who went right down there to Fallen Timbers, in the Miami Valley, where, I understand, my friend lives, to save people from the red man. Our fighting friend, George Washington, sent him there. The gentleman had evidently forgotten about him. He wanted to talk, and you know what was said of a man who made an application to the British Parliament for a place, the man having nothing else to recommend him, his sponsor said, "Does he not have a voice?"

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has more than a voice. Gentlemen would have been rid of me yesterday if it had not been for my friend TRUAX refusing to answer a little question which I wanted to put to him when he was talking about our friend Father Coughlin, and incorporating in the RECORD a speech by the Father. What was the need of putting that in, when all he said is in both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 2 years ago.

So there was no need to encumber the RECORD. These declarations of principles and promises are easy to make. They may be as easily made and as flippantly made by the Father, or by some Member over at the other end of the Capitol, but never kept. They are put there intended to be kept, but it is almost impossible for the crystallization of sentiment to find expression even in a body like this.

Now, the gentleman from the West is opposed to war. He approximates what we call in the East a pacifist. He said that the Navy was no good anyway. What good has the Navy ever been? Where is there a man who in his youth was awakened on that glorious Sunday morning when word came from Manila Bay that Dewey had sailed in and reduced the forts, and was going out to get breakfast and go back and finish the job? Was there not any glory in that for any American? When Admiral Schley went down on the curving shores of Cuba and made a shapeless mass of that Spanish fleet, was there no glory? People were scared to death up here thinking that he was about to come up to Philadelphia and bring General Weyler with him—

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. No; thank you. I intend to refer to some of the things that the gentleman said, but give me time. Now, I am through with the other point. I might say that the gentleman said they were no good. Then again, when Perry was up on Lake Erie, did anybody give vibrant response to the word that came to this country when he conquered the British on Lake Erie?

When Farragut sailed over the mines of Mobile Bay and someone said to him, "Don't you hear the click of the mines?" and Farragut said, "To hell with the mines", and they went over and conquered Mobile Bay. That was Farragut. He was a southerner. And then of Paul Jones, Decatur, Barry, Sims, the last named of my own district, what of the glory reflected from their achievements? We are not complaining about where a man comes from in America, as long as he is an American. We are more apt to think of what was said by Henry Ward Beecher after he tried to explain to a mob in London about slavery. Someone cried out, "Well, why don't you let them go?" He then explained in his philosophic and statesmanlike way why he did not want them to go. Then they said, "Well, why don't you lick them?" "Lick them?" And he may have used a more emphatic word, but he said, "Lick them?" We might, but they are Americans, and they are not so easy to lick."

Now, I am for peace, double-extract peace; plenty of it; but I am for that flag first. I am for all it typifies and symbolizes. I am for the sacred memory of all the men and women who have fought and bled for it. Perhaps I would believe these people of Europe if I had not been here when we went into war, when we went through it and came out of it.

Mr. LUCKEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. I must be excused.

I would believe you gentlemen when you talk about reducing the Navy, but I believe it would be an impeachment of our Nation's integrity if we accepted the suggestion of

the gentleman from Connecticut in the presence of the crooked diplomats of Europe.

Who is there who thinks so little of America as to impeach her integrity compared with the defaulters on their obligations? I think that is an insult to America, to come here and think for a minute that we would not keep our word and they would keep their word. That is one reason I am going to vote for this bill. If I thought these European diplomatic crooks would keep their word, I would not vote for it. You do not have a chance if you have nothing more than faith in them for America's defense. As someone said here, "It is a progressive age. All things are relative." He said more than he thought he did. All things are relative. True enough. He meant, then, that if we increased the Navy and the other fellow increased his, we would be on a parity just as we were; but there is more than that in the matter of things being on a parity or on an equality. The question with me is integrity. As I say, they cheated and lied to Woodrow Wilson. We saw him broken-hearted, disappointed, sickened, and die because of the perfidy of the diplomats of Europe when they deceived him in that treaty. Who now is going to trust anything but the strong arm of defense? That is what I am for—the defense of my country. I do not want anyone to ever question the integrity of the American people nor its power nor its glory that has reflected itself over this land and made the heart of every boy and every girl and every mother in this country glad and proud and safe and free.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In view of the fact—

Mr. FOCHT. I do not yield.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In view of the fact—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In view of the fact that the gentleman called attention to me—

Mr. FOCHT. Oh, yes. I would like to call attention to the gentleman often.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. But the gentleman has done pretty well wrapping the flag about himself.

Mr. FOCHT. And proud of it, and it would be great glory to be wrapped in it when I die. But give us more of that Connecticut philosophy.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. It is pretty good philosophy. In view of the fact that we are about to enter—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes in order that I may answer the gentleman.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Let me conclude my question first.

Mr. FOCHT. I have your question all right.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. No; the gentleman has not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. My question is, in view of the fact that we are about to enter into a naval conference with these foreign nations which the gentleman has so loudly traduced, does it seem fair or even honest on our part to go into that naval conference with an increased Navy, and then ask the other nations for a reduction?

Mr. FOCHT. Now, that is your question?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. I call the attention of the House to the answer given me this morning by a man whose intelligence shines out today as it has for the 20 years I have known him, the chairman of this committee, Mr. VINSON. When I asked him whether at the time we sank to the bottom of the sea 40 battleships, cruisers, war boats, or whatever they may be called, England had done likewise, he did not say yes; and that is the basis of my suspicion of them. I would not trust them out of sight or out of gunshot after what they did. I saw them sink to their knees and ask us in the name of God to help save them from the Kaiser. We went over.

Woodrow Wilson was to get democracy. What kind of democracy did he get?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I take it, then, the gentleman feels we should not have gone over?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; we ought to have gone over after the insult which was hurled against us and after we had agreed to go over. We voted for war after we were in the war—the President had us in it; and, of course, I never desert the flag, and I hope the gentleman from Connecticut will not. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under the consent previously granted me, I insert at this point a copy of a speech I delivered in this House on Tuesday, January 17, 1911, on the subject of aerial navies, in which will be found incorporated suggestions for the use of airplanes in the defense of our country and the response, or acquiescence, given by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Hull:

SPEECH OF HON. BENJAMIN K. FOCHT

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 31237) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912—

Mr. FOCHT said:

Mr. Chairman, in this era of conservation, economy, and reform, I must agree with some Members of this House that an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to maintain the American Army in time of peace is indeed staggering, if not almost bewildering, and we need not be surprised at the adverse comments we hear from the people of the country.

When Napoleon was under examination in a military school in France he was asked: "What would you do if you were in a fort surrounded by a hostile force and you needed supplies? What would you do for relief?" His reply was: "I would get them from the enemy."

But if we were in conflict with Germany, it is pretty far for us to go to Germany to get our supplies, although we might. If we were in conflict with Japan, it would be pretty far to go there, and yet we might. So I agree that if we are preparing for a conflict with either of these great powers we should be ready. I have heard war declared with Japan on this floor a number of times by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson] and by other gentlemen through newspaper interviews, and the contemplated article that was to have been published by General Huidekoper as to the possibility of an awful conflict with Germany. Every 2 years since I have been here there has been from some source a declaration of war about the time that this appropriation bill has been up for consideration.

I agree with the gentleman that the future conflicts will come suddenly and will be soon decided. There sat on the steps of this Capitol many years ago Mr. Samuel Morse, pleading for \$30,000 to build his telegraph line, and an eminent Congressman, who was afterward elected governor of a State of this Union, said derisively and sarcastically: "If you build a line to Baltimore, why not build one to the moon?"

Now, at the risk of incurring the ridicule of the Members of this House, I would like to ask you today, in the light of the evolution of the flying machine and of the accomplishments of the daring aviators who have pierced the clouds and flown across the skies, what consideration have you given to the possibility and the hope of finally eliminating absolutely the horrors of war on account of the destructiveness of these aerial machines?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We have given it no consideration, because we have had no opportunity. I will say to the gentleman that I believe the airplane of the future is going to be a great benefit to the world and absolutely necessary to be used by the nations as scouts of the air in time of war, but nothing on the subject was submitted in the estimates, and it would be extra judicial if we should take it up. So, much as I believe in the possibilities of utilizing these machines, there was no opportunity for the committee to submit anything on the subject.

Mr. FOCHT. Instead of appropriating without consideration of the proposition, I submit that it would have been better to have looked into it, in view of the known possibilities and deadly effect of these machines. If there should be war between this and any other country, the use of them, with their deadly possibilities, would mean annihilation. If both countries are supplied with instruments so deadly as these machines will be, then there will be no war. It seems to me it would have been a step in the direction of progress and in answer to the call of the people of all the world for peace if some consideration had been given to these instruments of death, which in their power of annihilation will ultimately bring universal peace.

It was a Pittsburgh blacksmith who invented the range finder, and two mechanics, the Wright brothers, from Akron, Ohio, have furnished the most deadly instrument known to warfare; and it is but a just tribute to these men to say that the genius of their inventions will in all probability bring about ultimate peace through the instrumentality of their deadliness. I think it would have been wise—without any criticism of our Committee on Military Affairs, but having full confidence in that committee, their respect for the spirit and genius and courage of the American soldier—it would be wise to give our soldiers the best armament

that there is in the world, because behind our guns are the greatest bravery and the most unselfish courage. Yet we must not forget that the criticism and the discussion going on throughout the country today is based upon the useless expenditures, if any, of this Government; and if 70 percent of all the revenues of the Government go for the Army and Navy in time of peace, it seems to me the committee should consider an appropriation of a part of this vast amount of money in at least experimenting with that instrument which may bring about peace and save at least one-half of this appropriation. If it will amount to anything, it will mean the utter elimination of war, followed by universal disarmament and consequent conservation of countless lives and treasure beyond estimate. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no part of the moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or herein made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as altering or repealing the proviso contained in section 1 of the act to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, approved February 13, 1929, which provides that the first and each succeeding alternate cruiser upon which work is undertaken, together with the main engines, armor, and armament shall be constructed or manufactured in the Government navy yards, naval gun factories, naval ordnance plants, or arsenals of the United States, except such material or parts as are not customarily manufactured in such Government plants.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FIESINGER: Page 52, line 5, after the colon, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That whenever bids have been requested from and submitted by private contractors for the repair, purchase, or acquirement of any naval vessel, machinery, article or articles, no such naval vessel, machinery, article or articles may be repaired, manufactured, or produced in any navy yard or arsenal of the United States unless prior to the opening of said bids the navy yard or arsenal in question shall have submitted also a sealed bid on the same specifications as did the private contractors who submitted bids, in which bid there shall be taken into consideration all the cost factors which are considered by such navy yard or arsenal in estimating its costs of production."

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, except I feel that certain language which is part of the "boiler plate" of the bill should be corrected. It sounds innocent enough on its face but really it has fangs in it and allows the navy yards of this country in competition with private business to destroy private business.

The point of the amendment is this: The New York Navy Yard, for instance, has certain facilities for doing work that is performed by private industry in this country on battle-ships. Under the language of the law they get this advantage: After private manufacturers have been called upon to submit bids on work at the request of the Navy Department and after the bids are submitted to the Department the navy yards in New York and elsewhere will put in bids based upon fictitious prices and walk away with the business. I know that has been done in connection with certain business conducted in my city of Sandusky, Ohio. Under honest competitive conditions which take into consideration all the legitimate factors of cost, the people located in my city can beat the costs in the New York Navy Yard. This plant of which I speak manufactures large brass cylinders that are used to cover propeller shafts, that is, those shafts which go through the rear of the vessel to the propellers. The sleeves of those shafts are made of

brass and are used to cover the steel. It is fine, precision work. If the Government is allowed to continue competing with private industry under the practices they have used heretofore of submitting fictitious prices in secret bids it means that five or six highly specialized businesses in the United States will be destroyed, businesses that we shall need in time of war, because during the last war these plants, performing highly specialized manufacture, were operating 24 hours a day.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Fiesinger. I yield.

Mr. Sisson. Would the gentleman put the navy yards out of business? What more logical thing could there be than to put the manufacturer of armaments and munitions under the control of the Government, especially in view of the strong feeling throughout the country supporting the bill to take the profits out of war?

Mr. Fiesinger. I have no complaint to make if the Government plants want to go ahead and build these things; let them go ahead and build them. But when they ask for bids from private business, then let the navy yards compete on the same basis as the private manufacturers.

Mr. Sisson. Must not all competitive bidding necessarily be secret? Otherwise it would not be competitive.

Mr. Fiesinger. Quite true; but there is no reason why all who bid should not figure on the same basis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. Jacobsen. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chairman. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. Fiesinger. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order should be withdrawn. This is justice as against the point of order. I talked to the Parliamentarian about it. Furthermore, I do not believe the committee really objects to the amendment.

I would like to have this incorporated in the bill, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw the point of order so that the Members may vote upon this proposition of justice to the private manufacturers of the country.

The Chairman. The Chair is ready to rule. The proposed amendment is clearly legislation, therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. Thompson. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Thompson: Page 52, line 5, after the word "Government", strike out everything down to and including line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed as altering or repealing the provisions contained in the acts to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels approved February 13, 1929, and March 27, 1934, which provide that the first and succeeding alternate vessels in each category upon which work is undertaken, together with the main engines, armor, and armament, shall be constructed or manufactured in the Government navy yards, naval gun factories, naval ordnance plants, or arsenals in the United States, except such material or parts as are not customarily manufactured in such Government plants."

Mr. Cary. Mr. Chairman, the Committee accepts that amendment. It is merely clarifying.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Cary. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In expending appropriations or portions of appropriations contained in this act, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the Assistant Secretaries of the Navy, the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate:

Provided, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Koppelman], which in substance provided that the amount of money carried for one item of this appropriation bill should not be used or made available for naval construction, was not adopted. I appreciate the position taken by members of the committee, both the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Naval Affairs, that this is not new construction. But there is a good deal of confusion here about what is an underaged vessel and an obsolete vessel, and what is or what is not new construction.

Mr. Chairman, we had an opportunity—and I am sorry that we passed it up without speaking very much about it or really considering it at all—to do something constructive for the cause of peace in the world. Frankly, I cannot speak in any other way than in plain English. I think we fumbled the ball. However, that is water over the dam.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism of this very fine, able Subcommittee on Appropriations which reported this bill. I am not a member of the committee. I was not present at their deliberations, did not ask to be, and it was my fault I was not there. I just was not there. I want to state an understanding I have, but this is hearsay. It was not stated to me by a member of the committee, so I am not binding them or reflecting upon them in making this statement. I understand there was a good deal of sentiment in the Subcommittee on Appropriations for a provision in this bill substantially to the same effect as the Koppelman amendment. Why not? Why should we go into the London Naval Conference next year presuming and assuming that nothing is going to result from that conference?

Mr. Vinson of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia. When is that conference going to be called and who is going to call it?

Mr. Sisson. The conference is called for 1936, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia. The gentleman is in error. No conference has been called. The conference broke up in London last December.

Mr. Sisson. There is a general understanding that there is to be another conference in 1936. Now, why quibble about the matter when we are confronted with realities?

Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of talk here that this is not new construction; that this is just building up under-aged vessels and replacing those which are obsolete. I wonder how many Members understand that the term "obsolete" does not mean that a vessel is antiquated? So far as its modernization and efficiency is concerned, the term "obsolete" has nothing to do with it. It means that by the provisions of those treaties there is a presumption that after a vessel obtains a certain age the country possessing it may wish to improve it. Therefore, the country possessing that vessel may replace it under the terms of the treaty.

The statement was also made by gentlemen on the other side that we had committed ourselves to build up to this treaty. There is no such thing, however. That is absolute nonsense, and I am surprised that anybody would make the statement. That was the maximum limit beyond which we had no right to build.

I do not want to attack this bill. I appreciate that some money is necessary for keeping up the efficiency of our Navy, but we are appropriating nearly \$200,000,000 more in this

bill, according to the committee's own report, than was appropriated last year. I had hoped that we might do something that would make it appear to the other nations of the world that we were not preparing for war; that we were not preparing to align ourselves with any of the combinations of nations that go into this precarious, this delicate, machinery controlling the peace of the world known as the "balance of power." Therefore, I am sorry that the Kopplemann amendment was not agreed to.

Since it was not agreed to, as another gesture toward peace and also to lighten our tax burden, at the appropriate time I shall offer a motion to recommit this bill to the committee with instructions to reduce the amount of the appropriations by 20 percent, and I hope the motion will be agreed to. [Applause.]

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCORMACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7672) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendations that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion by Mr. Sisson to recommit H. R. 7672 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back with such amendments as will reduce the total amount appropriated 20 percent.

Mr. SISSON. On this motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU)—ayes 24, noes 162.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order of no quorum and object to the vote on that ground.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and one Members present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 56, nays 289, answered "present" 1, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—56

Amile	Engel	Lemke	Rankin
Biermann	Fletcher	Lewis, Md.	Rich
Binderup	Ford, Miss.	Luckey	Russell
Boileau	Gehrman	Ludlow	Sauthoff
Brown, Mich.	Goldsborough	Lundeen	Schneider
Buckler, Minn.	Hildebrandt	McFarlane	Scott
Burdick	Hill, Knute	Marcantonio	Sisson
Carpenter	Hoffman	Maverick	Stefan
Christianson	Hope	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Coffee	Hull	Monaghan	Tobey
Cole, N. Y.	Kimball	Murdock	Turner
Crosser, Ohio	Koppleman	O'Day	Utterback
Dunn, Pa.	Kvale	Patterson	Wearin
Eicher	Lambertson	Pearson	Zimmerman

NAYS—289

Adair	Arnold	Blackney	Boylan
Allen	Ayers	Bland	Brennan
Andresen	Bacharach	Blanton	Brewster
Andrew, Mass.	Bacon	Bloom	Brown, Ga.
Andrews, N. Y.	Barden	Boland	Brunner
Arends	Beiter	Bolton	Buchanan

LXXIX—409

Buck	Faddis	Lehlbach	Romjue
Buckbee	Farley	Lesinski	Rudd
Bulwinkle	Fenerty	Lewis, Colo.	Ryan
Burnham	Fiesinger	McAndrews	Sadowski
Caldwell	Fish	McClellan	Sanders, Tex.
Cannon, Mo.	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Sandlin
Carden	Flannagan	McGehee	Schulte
Carmichael	Focht	McGrath	Scrugham
Carter	Ford, Calif.	McGroarty	Sears
Cary	Fuller	McKeough	Secrest
Casey	Fulmer	McLaughlin	Seger
Castellow	Gavagan	McLean	Shanley
Cavicchia	Gearhart	McLeod	Short
Church	Gifford	McMillan	Sirovich
Citron	Gilchrist	McSwain	Smith, Conn.
Claiborne	Gildea	Maas	Smith, Va.
Cochran	Gingery	Mahon	Smith, Wash.
Colden	Goodwin	Mansfield	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, Md.	Granfield	Mapes	Snell
Collins	Gray, Ind.	Martin, Colo.	Snyder
Colmer	Gray, Pa.	Martin, Mass.	Somers, N. Y.
Connery	Green	May	South
Cooley	Greenway	Mead	Spence
Cooper, Tenn.	Greenwood	Merritt, Conn.	Starnes
Corning	Grever	Merritt, N. Y.	Stewart
Costello	Gregory	Michener	Stubbs
Cox	Guyer	Millard	Sullivan
Cravens	Gwynne	Miller	Summers, Tex.
Crosby	Haines	Mitchell, Ill.	Sutphin
Cross, Tex.	Hancock, N. Y.	Mott	Sweeney
Crowe	Harlan	Nelson	Taber
Crowther	Hart	Norton	Tarver
Cullen	Harter	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Cummings	Hartley	O'Connell	Taylor, S. C.
Daly	Healey	O'Connor	Terry
Darden	Hess	O'Leary	Thomason
Darrow	Higgins, Mass.	Oliver	Thompson
Dear	Hill, Ala.	O'Neal	Thurston
Deen	Hill, Samuel B.	Owen	Tinkham
Delaney	Hobbs	Palmisano	Tolan
Dempsey	Hoeppel	Parks	Tonry
Dies	Hollister	Parsons	Treadway
Dietrich	Holmes	Patman	Truax
Dingell	Hook	Patton	Umstead
Dirksen	Houston	Perkins	Vinson, Ga.
Ditter	Huddleston	Peterson, Fla.	Vinson, Ky.
Dobbins	Imhoff	Peterson, Ga.	Wadsworth
Dockweiler	Jacobsen	Pfeifer	Wallgren
Dorsey	Jencks, Ind.	Pierce	Warren
Doughton	Jenkins, Ohio	Pittenger	Weaver
Doutrich	Johnson, Tex.	Plumley	Welch
Doxey	Johnson, W. Va.	Polk	Werner
Drewry	Kahn	Powers	West
Driscoll	Kee	Quinn	Whelchel
Driver	Kelly	Rabaut	White
Duffey, Ohio	Kennedy, Md.	Ramsay	Whittington
Duffy, N. Y.	Kenney	Ramspeck	Wigglesworth
Duncan	Kerr	Randolph	Wilcox
Dunn, Miss.	Kinzer	Ransley	Williams
Eagle	Kleberg	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, La.
Eaton	Kloeb	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
Eckert	Kniffin	Reilly	Wolverton
Edmiston	Kocalkowski	Richards	Wood
Ekwall	Kramer	Robertson	Zioncheck
Ellenbogen	Lambeth	Robinson, Utah	
Englebright	Lanham	Robison, Ky.	
Evans	Larrabee	Rogers, Mass.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gillette

NOT VOTING—85

Ashbrook	Disney	Lee, Okla.	Rogers, Okla.
Bankhead	Dondero	Lloyd	Sabath
Beam	Ferguson	Lord	Sanders, La.
Bell	Fernandez	Lucas	Schaefer
Berlin	Frey	McReynolds	Schuetz
Boehne	Gambrill	Maloney	Shannon
Brooks	Gasque	Marshall	Stack
Buckley, N. Y.	Gassaway	Mason	Stegall
Burch	Griswold	Massingale	Thom
Cannon, Wis.	Halleck	Meeks	Thomas
Carlson	Hamlin	Montague	Turpin
Cartwright	Hancock, N. C.	Montet	Underwood
Celler	Hennings	Moran	Waiter
Chandler	Higgins, Conn.	Moritz	Wilson, Pa.
Chapman	Igoe	Nichols	Withrow
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Okla.	O'Malley	Wolfenden
Clark, N. C.	Jones	Pettengill	Woodruff
Cooper, Ohio	Keller	Peyser	Woodrum
Crawford	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rayburn	Young
Culkin	Knutson	Reece	
DeRouen	Lamneck	Richardson	
Dickstein	Lea, Calif.	Rogers, N. H.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. Withrow (for) with Mr. Cooper of Ohio (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Pettengill with Mr. Turpin.

Mr. Lucas with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Culin.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Wolfenden.
 Mr. Jones with Mr. Lord.
 Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Carlson.
 Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Knutson.
 Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Reece.
 Mr. Sabbath with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Woodruff.
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Chandler.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Massingale.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
 Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Berlin.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Steagall.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Keller.
 Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Underwood.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Lloyd.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Disney with Mr. Richardson.
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Hennings.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Igoe with Mr. Crawford.
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Dickstein.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. Gasque.
 Mr. Moran with Mr. O'Malley.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Ferguson.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Brooks.
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Hamlin.
 Mr. Gassaway with Mr. Gambrill.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Peyser.

Mr. AMLIE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, is absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. ROGERS, is necessarily absent. If he were here, he would vote "no" on the motion to recommit and "aye" on the passage of the bill.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. THOM, a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, was called from the floor on account of sickness in his family. If present, he would vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. BOEHNE, is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

A motion by Mr. CARY to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5914. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held in San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Colony of Connecticut, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL BUILDINGS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2035) to amend an act approved June 25, 1934, authorizing loans for the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of certain municipal buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2035) to

amend an act approved June 25, 1934, authorizing loans from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of certain municipal buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, and in lieu thereof, on page 1 of the Senate bill, line 9, delete the first comma and after the word "Act" insert the following: "(which, for the purposes of this Act, shall be construed to include any agency created or designated by the President for similar purposes under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935)"; and the House agree to the same.

MARY T. NORTON,
 HENRY ELLENBOGEN,
 EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

WILLIAM H. KING,
 CARTER GLASS,
 ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2035) to amend an act approved June 25, 1934, authorizing loans from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of certain municipal buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On amendment no. 1: The Senate bill authorized the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow, for the purposes of the act of June 25, 1934, from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. The House amendment authorized the Commissioners, in addition, to borrow from another agency. The Senate recedes with a clarifying amendment.

On amendment no. 2: This amendment authorized an advance of \$100,000, from the funds made available under the act, to the Children's Hospital for alterations and enlargement of buildings, equipment, and accessories. There was no corresponding provision in the Senate bill; and the Senate recedes.

MARY T. NORTON,
 EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
 HENRY ELLENBOGEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF OWNERS AND OPERATORS OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (S. 408) to promote safety on the public highways of the District of Columbia by providing for the financial responsibility of owners and operators of motor vehicles for damages caused by motor vehicles on the public highways in the District of Columbia; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 408) to promote safety on the public highways of the District of Columbia by providing for the financial responsibility of owners and operators of motor vehicles for damages caused by motor vehicles on the public highways in the District of Columbia; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

VINCENT L. PALMISANO,
 WRIGHT PATMAN,
 EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

WILLIAM H. KING,
 ROYAL S. COPELAND,
 ARTHUR CAPPER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 408) to promote safety on the public highways of the District of Columbia by providing for the financial responsibility of owners and operators of motor vehicles for damages caused by motor vehicles on the public highways in the District of Columbia; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill contained a provision that the operation of a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia by a nonresident or his agent should be deemed equivalent to the appointment of the director of vehicles and traffic as the agent of such nonresident for the service of legal process in any action growing out of an accident of collision. The procedure to be followed in connection with any such service was also set forth in the same provision. The House amendment struck out this provision; and the House recedes.

VINCENT L. PALMISANO,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

THE BANKING SYSTEM

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following resolution for printing under the rule, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 205

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7617, a bill to provide for the sound, effective, and uninterrupted operation of the banking system, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 15 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the gentleman to call this rule up the first thing Monday?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and I understand there are two conference reports, the rule for the consideration of the banking bill will be called up.

SOCIAL JUSTICE REQUIRES JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a speech delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] at Detroit, April 24, 1935, at the meeting of the National League for Social Justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understood the majority leader to state the other day that if these were political speeches he did not know that they should go into the RECORD, but I shall not object.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. WILLIAM P. CONNERY, Jr., at a meeting of the National Union for Social Justice, held in the city of Detroit, Mich., Wednesday, April 24, 1935.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Father Coughlin, and members of the National Union for Social Justice, it is gratifying to know that after battling for 13 years for social-justice legislation in the Congress of the United States, one's efforts are highly honored in being permitted to address this great gathering of American citizens who are working so unselfishly under the able leadership of Father Coughlin to better the pitiable conditions which abound among our millions of industrial workers and farmers in our land of plenty.

When I received the kind invitation from your great leader, Father Coughlin, asking that I address your first meeting, I was indeed gratified and felt highly honored. May I say at this point that I subscribe whole-heartedly to the 16 points laid down by the National Union for Social Justice.

As Chairman of the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, I naturally am in close touch with those who represent our millions of industrial workers. However, a study of our economic life and the conditions under which we live in the United States has taught me the need of giving sympathetic consideration and support to the needs and the wishes of the millions of our farmers and agriculture workers. It is pleasing on my part to be able to say to you that 2 years ago, for the first time since the creation of the House Labor Committee, representatives of all the farm organizations appeared before the Labor Committee and unanimously supported the Black-Connery 30-hour-week bill.

In passing I might add that in my early life I was taught by the Sulpician Fathers at Montreal and, later, by the Jesuits at Holy Cross of the interdependency of the farmer and the industrial workers.

As illustrative of the support the farmers receive from Congressmen from industrial sections, I not only voted for the Lemke bill but also signed the petition to force a vote thereon. The American farmers are dependent for their success on the ability of the millions of American industrial workers to purchase the products of the farmers at a price which will permit American farmers and their families to live decently. Likewise, our industrial workers are dependent, in great part, on the ability of the American farmers to buy the products of America's industrial workers.

Personally, I am interested solely in America and in Americans. During the World War I spent 19 months on the battlefields of France, with the Twenty-sixth (Yankee) Division, in the war which we supposedly fought to "save democracy", but which, in reality, as we have since learned, we fought to protect the investments and the profits of our international bankers.

We have lived to learn that those we saved from domination have but little gratitude for the sacrifices which we made. At the present time, and for the next generation or longer, the farmers and the industrial workers of America will be saddled with a debt of some \$15,000,000,000 which they must pay because of the repudiation of the debts owed to our people by the allied governments. In passing, may I suggest that no government would dare to repudiate its debts if it was not acting on the advice of the international bankers to whom they look to finance them in case of another war.

In the short time at my disposal today I am going to discuss with you one of the fundamental phases of social-justice legislation as it affects our workers, industrial and agricultural, and how, through the machinations and greed of our international bankers, millions of our people are today dependent upon relief, public and private.

The first and essential material need of our industrial workers is a steady job at wages which will permit of their providing for themselves and their families a decent living. The first and essential material need of our farmers is a market wherein they can sell their products at prices which will permit of their providing a decent living for themselves and their families.

I represent a congressional district which is almost wholly devoted to the production of industrial products which use or can use raw materials which are produced in our Western States.

Some of the finest woolen and worsted clothes in all the world are produced in Lawrence. Some of the finest boots and shoes are produced in my home city of Lynn, as well as in Lawrence. Some of the finest tanned and finished leathers in all the world are produced in Peabody and Salem. We have many other important industrial productions such as electrical machinery, paper, etc.

These goods are produced by highly skilled labor, and, in recent years, many of our highest skilled mechanics are denied employment through the mechanization of our industries, and the establishment in foreign countries of branch plants where the American machinery and low-wage labor is now available.

My people naturally constitute, when employed at decent wages, a wonderful market for the products of American farmers, as my people do not preach and do not practice any birth-control doctrine.

It has been the policy of our Government for the past 50 years to exclude Asiatic workers because of their low living standards. It has been the policy of our Government since 1921 to restrict the entry of immigrants from other countries to not more than 3 percent of those from the same country who were here in 1910.

With 25,000,000 of our people in need and dependent upon either public or private charity, there are none I have heard of who are asking that our Government make any drastic change in its policy on immigration legislation. It is true that there is a great demand that young children and the aged parents of those who reside here should be permitted entry, but these will not compete with America's farmers or industrial workers. There is a question of humane policy involved in this suggested change, and there is a substantial support for this reuniting of families.

Yet despite the fact that Asiatics are excluded and immigrants from other countries are limited to a certain small number each year, hundreds of thousands of our skilled industrial workers are unemployed, are denied a job, and are dependent upon charity solely because of the avariciousness and greed of our international bankers who, contrary to the spirit of our laws, distribute throughout our country the products of the very workers in foreign countries who we will not permit to enter into our country, the reason, as usual, being that our international bankers can secure larger profits.

The workers of the Asiatic countries are not excluded because of their particular race or their particular color. They are barred

from entering into the United States solely because of their low living standards and because of their willingness to work for wages which American workers could not live decently upon.

Yet while we exclude Asiatics and permit the entry of only a certain number of workers from other countries each year, we permit the products of these very workers the freest access to our markets, displacing the products of our own workers.

Last Saturday night Alfred Sloan, president General Motors Co., and Gerard Swope, president General Electric Co., delivered a joint radio address over a Nation-wide network provided for them by the child of the Power Trust, the National Broadcasting Co. These gentlemen, apparently ignoring the fact that some 15,000,000 of our workers are now unemployed and that our laws exclude the entry of asiatics and restrict the entry of immigrants from other countries, advocated that we change our present governmental policy and permit the freer entry of the products of the very workers to whom we deny entry to and which compete in the American market with the products of our own workers.

Of course, such a policy would permit of additional profits to international bankers who deal in foreign exchange. Also such a policy would permit of larger importations of the products of the branch factories which these companies control in Asia, depriving additional thousands of American workers of job opportunities.

In passing I might direct your attention to the fact that these radio addresses were delivered under the auspices of the World Peace Foundation, America's leading advocate of the United States entry into the League of Nations and the World Court.

At the present time the products of Asiatic and European workers are delivered in the American market by international bankers at total landed tariff costs duty paid, costs which are less than the costs of production of similar articles the products of America's workers and farmers.

We in the eastern section of our country are now advised that if we will eliminate our demands for the consumption and use of American farm and industrial products that our State Department will reduce the present tariff duties on wheat, corn, canned meats, vegetables, and dairy products, which we in the industrial sections try to use in our everyday life. This will permit of these products being sold to us at a reduction of from 20 to 40 percent. We are told that with the low carrying charges imposed by the steamships the international bankers will be able to deliver the products of Argentina and Canada to the industrial workers of the Atlantic coast cities to our benefit, in the way of reduced costs to us.

Under the able leadership of the present Governor of my State, Massachusetts, Hon. James M. Curley, one of the keenest Americans now in public life, not one dollar of our State money is spent for any products other than the products of American industrial and agricultural workers, when the same are available.

You may have noted that at times I have referred to our international bankers. In many cases the products of foreign workers which are distributed in the American market are produced in factories or workshops which are owned in America, and those products are entered at less than American costs of production of similar goods.

Millions of the electric-light bulbs which are produced in Japan and sold in America, depriving America's workers of employment, are produced on machines the patents of which are owned in America, in a factory in which the General Electric Co. held or holds a five-eighths ownership of stock, thus controlling the company.

The many millions of rubber accessories which are yearly imported from Japan and sold in the American market are produced in a factory in Japan which is controlled by the Goodrich Tire & Rubber Co., of Akron, Ohio.

You may not know that each year millions of cases of canned meats are imported and sold in our eastern cities. These canned meats, it is true, come from Argentina, but they come from packing plants which are controlled by the American Meat Packing Trust, which controls these branch plants in Argentina.

Naturally, American workers cannot continue to secure decent wages and decent hours of work if the international bankers are able to secure entry of the products of those very workers our laws deny entry to. With millions of our workers continually unemployed, our farmers are deprived of their most profitable market.

Time does not permit my emphasizing, as strongly as I would like to, the imperative need of national legislation providing for a 30-hour work week and the economic freedom of our industrial workers through the enactment of the Wagner-Connery labor-disputes bill. Both of these measures are now pending before Congress.

In closing I might direct your attention to the need of perfecting some plan whereby those unemployed industrial workers, who have been deprived of opportunities of employment through the mechanization of industry, shall be provided for. I have been studying a plan whereby we would provide for these workers through a tax on the increased power utilized through the mechanization of our industries.

As one who has continually worked to secure legislation which would make possible social justice among the people of our land, I am happy to be with you and I wish to congratulate publicly the wonderfully effective work which has been accomplished by the creator of the National Union for Social Justice, the Reverend Charles E. Coughlin.

COSTIGAN-WAGNER ANTILYNCHING BILL

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker, there is no fury in the world that exceeds mob fury. It is worse than the fury of the elements, the stampede of the herd, or any other action on the part of man or beast. It seems to arise almost out of thin air and disappears the same way without any reason or excuse, but while it is in existence it constitutes a state of violent anger, of ungovernable rage, and a fit of raving passion. It is a blot on any community in which it takes place and a curse to civilization and which has been the endeavor of society to stamp out for some considerable time.

Such a measure to accomplish this end is proposed in what is known as the "Costigan-Wagner bill", S. 24, now pending and being debated in the Senate of the United States. This is a just and righteous bill to prevent such mob assemblage in the future. The only question is as to whether the punishment is severe enough in this act. No one desires to justify the action of any criminal but according to the Constitution of this country, every person accused is entitled to the protection of the law and mob action results in general in the punishment of the innocent and constitutes the commission of the most heinous crime that can be imagined.

I hope this bill passes the Senate and that I have the opportunity to support and vote for it in the House. The citizens of my district are very much interested and favor the passage of this act, and I am receiving resolutions in support of this bill, which read as follows:

Be it resolved, That we, the undersigned, cognizant of the ever-increasing "lynch law", as resorted to in certain sections of the Southern States, are fearful of the laxity of the several States to institute and prosecute to the ends of justice such practices as have been perpetrated upon certain racial groups in violation of duly constituted law—the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution—and the dictates of our conscience impel us, with thousands of others, to protest in the name of fair play, justice, and civilization, and instruct you, our Representative, to vote for the Costigan-Wagner antilynch bill.

In one instance I received such resolution signed by the following persons residing in Clay Center, Kans.: Mrs. Rosa Buckner, Mr. George Holmes, Mr. John Massey, Rev. R. N. Ward, Mr. Bud Ferguson, Mrs. Bud Ferguson, Mrs. Cynthia Baker, Mr. Pompey Russell, Mrs. Lydia Russell, Mr. Ray Davy, Mrs. R. N. Ward, Mr. Mark Griffin, Mr. Fred Buckner, Mr. Frank Davy, Mrs. Estelle Davy, Mrs. Sylvesta Smith, Mr. Isaac Wofford, Mr. "Book" Lawton, Mrs. Anna Lawton, Mr. Henry Nichols, Mr. Harry Holmes, Mrs. Geneva Russell, Mr. Joseph Russell, Mrs. Jennie Wilhite, Mr. George Wiggins.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Monday, April 29, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

313. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for March 1935, together with a statement of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case (H. Doc. No. 167), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. POLK: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6361. A bill to amend the Filled Milk Act; without amendment

(Rept. No. 796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROMJUE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 7709. A bill to provide time credits for substitute laborers in the Post Office when appointed as regular laborer; without amendment (Rept. No. 797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1712. An act to amend section 4878 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to burials in national cemeteries; without amendment (Rept. No. 798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KRAMER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7170. A bill to authorize the naturalization of certain resident alien World War veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 801). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROMJUE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 7688. A bill to provide for the appointment and promotion of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UTTERBACK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3430. A bill to amend the act approved May 14, 1930, entitled "An act to reorganize the administration of Federal prisons, to authorize the Attorney General to contract for the care of United States prisoners, to establish Federal jails, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 803). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3214. A bill for the relief of Capt. Robert E. Coughlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 7755) authorizing the erection of a memorial statue of Chief Plenty Coos; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 7756) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of obsolete boats and equipment therefor to municipalities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 7757) to amend section 3345, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the removal of fermented malt liquors from brewery premises without stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 7758) relating to the appointment of cadets at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 7759) relating to the compensation of Immigration and Naturalization Service guards and matrons; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7760) to disallow certain deductions for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 7761) to provide that payment of adjusted-service credit may be made to the estate of the veteran if no eligible dependent is surviving; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 7762) to amend the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 7763) to encourage home ownership and reduce farm-land tenantry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7764) to relieve restricted Indians whose lands have been taxed or have been lost by failure to pay taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 7765) to amend (1) an act entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; (2) an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia"; to regulate the giving of official bonds by officers and employees of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McLEAN: Resolution (H. Res. 206) directing the Committee on Military Affairs to inquire into and investigate the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TERRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 262) to extend the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission to Little Rock on the Arkansas River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BURDICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) making an appropriation for relief of old or nonemployable Indians; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GASSAWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 264) providing that the Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) pertaining to an appropriate celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the expedition of Hernando De Soto; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, supporting House bill 4298; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 7766) for the relief of the Eberhart Steel Products Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORD of California: A bill (H. R. 7767) for the relief of Otto Hornick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: A bill (H. R. 7768) for the relief of the legal representatives of John T. Brickwood, deceased, Edward Gaynor, Theodore Gebler, Lee W. Mix, Arthur L. Peck, Thomas D. Casanega, Joseph de Lusignan, and Joseph H. Berger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRISWOLD: A bill (H. R. 7769) granting a pension to Sanford W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 7770) granting a pension to Ella A. Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALONEY: A bill (H. R. 7771) for the relief of the Carbine-Harang Machinery & Supply Co., Inc., and their assigns or successors; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 7772) granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Allard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7773) granting a pension to Mary H. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7627. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petition headed by C. G. Riddle, of Muldrow, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7628. Also, petition headed by Charles Brown, of Webbers Falls, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7629. Also, petition headed by M. Piggee, of Lenapah, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7630. Also, petition headed by Thomas Montgomery, of Goodwater, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7631. Also, petition headed by John Hull, of Wickhaven, Pa., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7632. Also, petition headed by M. Bidden, of Dow, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7633. Also, petition headed by Moses Tomkins, of Henryetta, Okla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7634. Also, petition headed by A. E. Rugger, of North Topeka, Kans., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7635. Also, petition headed by Antonio A. Cordova, of Maxwell, N. Mex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7636. Also, petition headed by William Heyward, of Greenville, S. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7637. Also, petition headed by R. Hicks, of Marshall, Tex., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7638. Also, petition headed by L. Siegman, of Nashville, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7639. Also, petition headed by L. Mitchem, of Crumpler, W. Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7640. Also, petition headed by Dominick Santucci, of Chicago, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7641. Also, petition headed by C. Woods, of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7642. Also, petition headed by J. A. Griffin, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7643. Also, petition headed by Vick Taubnack, of West Union, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7644. Also, petition headed by Ora Johnson, of Owensboro, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7645. Also, petition headed by John B. Rhoads, of Graniteville, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7646. Also, petition headed by Eddie Pippens, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7647. Also, petition headed by M. Cain, of Newark, N. J., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7648. Also, petition headed by C. Nassiotone, of Carteret, N. J., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7649. Also, petition headed by F. Moody, of Cedartown, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7650. Also, petition headed by C. C. Beatenbaugh, of Felton, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7651. Also, petition headed by L. Brown, of Satsuma, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7652. Also, petition headed by F. H. Burns, of Nauvoo, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7653. Also, petition headed by William Shelton, of For-dyce, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7654. Also, petition headed by Robert Lee Caldwell, of Renfro, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7655. Also, petition headed by N. M. Kinsey, of Barryton, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7656. Also, petition headed by Edward Minger, of Selma, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7657. Also, petition headed by Wesley Smith, of Indianola, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7658. Also, petition headed by W. L. West, of Russellville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7659. Also, petition headed by Frank M. Kuder, of Omaha, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7660. Also, petition headed by Will Smith, of Bradley, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7661. Also, petition headed by F. M. English, of Banks, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7662. Also, petition headed by Samuel Turner, of Blytheville, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7663. Also, petition headed by W. H. McMichen, of Dallas, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7664. Also, petition headed by A. J. Jordan, of Thomaston, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7665. Also, petition headed by Perry Forest, of Pocahontas, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7666. Also, petition headed by R. F. Short, of Lake City, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7667. Also, petition headed by J. L. Cooper, of McDougal, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7668. Also, petition headed by John Rose, of Somerville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7669. Also, petition headed by H. P. Amason, of Pineville, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7670. Also, petition headed by D. Salvadori, of Alabama City, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7671. Also, petition headed by A. Yarbrough, of Bastrop, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7672. Also, petition headed by J. Conley, of Huntersville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7673. Also, petition headed by E. Thomason, of Dawson Springs, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7674. Also, petition headed by J. H. McDonald, of Marianna, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7675. Also, petition headed by Curtis Dalton, of Pedro, Ohio, favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7676. Also, petition headed by B. Davison, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7677. Also, petition headed by John Alexander, of Martin, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7678. Also, petition headed by J. F. Dunlap, of Steppville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7679. Also, petition headed by W. L. Myhan, of Tuscumbia, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7680. Also, petition headed by J. D. Stewart, of Pelham, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7681. Also, petition headed by V. L. Dingler, of Cedartown, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7682. Also, petition headed by P. L. Dodd, of Nauvoo, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7683. Also, petition headed by Louis Edwards, of Blount Springs, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7684. Also, petition headed by Willie Pearson, of Isola, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7685. Also, petition headed by K. Grady, of Dry Branch, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7686. Also, petition headed by John Dean, of Arabi, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7687. Also, petition headed by W. C. Dukes, of Albany, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7688. Also, petition headed by J. W. Woods, of Corona, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7689. Also, petition headed by Henry L. Hanbarrior, of Kannapolis, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7690. Also, petition headed by K. High, of Aberdeen, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7691. Also, petition headed by Monroe Sellers of Black, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7692. Also, petition headed by Phillip Thorp, of Lawrence, Kans., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7693. Also, petition headed by M. Ruehl, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7694. Also, petition headed by B. Willcutt, of Corona, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7695. Also, petition headed by J. D. Johnson, of Holt, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7696. Also, petition headed by S. Reeves, of East Tallassee, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7697. Also, petition headed by L. McCurtis, of Mount Vernon, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7698. Also, petition headed by C. L. Grissons, of Pinson, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7699. Also, petition headed by S. L. Holeman, of Henderson, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7700. Also, petition headed by D. C. Mullina, of Oakman, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7701. Also, petition headed by J. W. Wilson, of Driver, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7702. Also, petition headed by Bryant Pierson, of Enterprise, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7703. Also, petition headed by B. H. Sowards, of Smith Mills, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7704. Also, petition headed by C. E. Hutson, of Decatur, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7705. Also, petition headed by J. P. Dyer, of Brookhaven, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7706. Also, petition headed by Preston Hart, of Brookhaven, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7707. Also, petition headed by Clarence Jones, of Atherton, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7708. Also, petition headed by T. W. Taylor, of Bay Minette, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7709. Also, petition headed by Albert R. Smith, of Oneonta, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7710. Also, petition headed by J. H. Harris, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7711. Also, petition headed by Abe Calding, of Roland, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7712. Also, petition headed by C. L. Muihen, of Gadsden, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7713. Also, petition headed by Gus Ricks, of Forrest City, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7714. Also, petition headed by William Irwin, of Murphysboro, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7715. Also, petition headed by A. B. Curtis, of Green Grove, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7716. Also, petition headed by John A. Coats, of Murry Cross, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7717. Also, petition headed by M. Rhodes, of Manfield, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7718. Also, petition headed by S. E. Kindrick, of Bessemer, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7719. Also, petition headed by W. T. Pemberton, of McLeansboro, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7720. Also, petition headed by Ernest Lilley, of Florien, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7721. Also, petition headed by J. W. Shelton, of Sebree, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7722. Also, petition headed by Joe F. Richards, of Hopeville, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7723. Also, petition headed by L. Richards, of Hapeville, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7724. Also, petition headed by C. Jessie, of Natchitoches, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7725. Also, petition headed by R. V. Stephens, of Alpharetta, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7726. Also, petition headed by L. Jackson, of Gillespie, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7727. Also, petition headed by E. Baker, of Sparta, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7728. Also, petition headed by Jim McCord, of Charleston, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7729. Also, petition headed by Rev. W. M. Cox, of Batesville, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7730. Also, petition headed by A. C. Hathcoc, of Amory, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7731. Also, petition headed by J. S. Mitchell, of Anniston, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7732. Also, petition headed by Grady Cook, of Ohatchee, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7733. Also, petition headed by R. G. Hall, of Falkville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7734. Also, petition headed by J. C. William, of Villa Ridge, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7735. Also, petition headed by Ollie Kirtland, of La Belle, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7736. Also, petition headed by M. Ownes, of Calion, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7737. Also, petition headed by N. L. Cheldres, of Aberdeen, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS,

the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7738. Also, petition headed by Clarence Isebell, of Gideon, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7739. Also, petition headed by H. O. Fowler, of Fort Payne, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7740. Also, petition headed by M. C. Sewell, of Collinsville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7741. Also, petition headed by E. Washington, of St. Joseph, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7742. Also, petition headed by Henry Reed, of Warrior, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7743. Also, petition headed by J. Jones, of Midway, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7744. Also, petition headed by M. Tubb, of Amory, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7745. Also, petition headed by King C. Goldsby, of Selma, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7746. Also, petition headed by Green Ross, of Waverly, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7747. Also, petition headed by E. Steiner, of Woodlawn, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7748. Also, petition headed by R. I. Shirlup, of Dothan, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7749. Also, petition headed by H. Swoopes, of Decatur, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7750. Also, petition headed by B. Thomas, of Schoolfield, Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7751. Also, petition headed by M. Franks, of Aberdeen, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7752. Also, petition headed by Joseph Humphrey, of England, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7753. Also, petition headed by A. Flowers, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7754. Also, petition headed by W. A. Gaston, of Newborn, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7755. Also, petition headed by Dr. Joe Jones, of Dawson Springs, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7756. Also, petition headed by L. Steward, of McKenzie, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7757. Also, petition headed by J. Marshall, of McKenzie, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7758. Also, petition headed by L. M. Skelton, of Columbia, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7759. Also, petition headed by W. R. Gilbert, of McKenzie, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7760. Also, petition headed by B. Brewer, of Weona, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7761. Also, petition headed by L. T. Thomas, of Greenwood, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7762. Also, petition headed by B. Jackson, of Toxey, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7763. Also, petition headed by S. D. Gill, of Aberdeen, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7764. Also, petition headed by R. T. McFall, of Williston, Fla., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7765. Also, petition headed by L. Stewart, of Leslie, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7766. Also, petition headed by J. W. Ashley, of Phil Campbell, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7767. Also, petition headed by J. D. Graham, of Walker, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7768. Also, petition headed by George Hays, of Ashburn, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7769. Also, petition headed by M. Roberson, of Dardanelle, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7770. Also, petition headed by A. McAlister, of Taft, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7771. Also, petition headed by Jim Holloway, of Louisville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7772. Also, petition headed by W. W. Keys, of Tunnel Hill, Ga., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7773. Also, petition headed by Henry H. Smith, of Henagar, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7774. Also, petition headed by J. Harp, of Boaz, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7775. Also, petition headed by Jacob Reddoch, of Troy, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7776. Also, petition headed by Frank Anderson, of Hollandale, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7777. Also, petition headed by Robert Thomas, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7778. Also, petition headed by C. A. Wheeler, of Fulton, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7779. Also, petition headed by D. Dunbar, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7780. Also, petition headed by J. A. Totty, of Trumann, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7781. Also, petition headed by L. Holden, of Copperhill, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7782. Also, petition headed by H. J. Coleman, of Earl, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7783. Also, petition headed by H. H. Smith, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7784. Also, petition headed by V. Hudson, of Archibald, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7785. Also, petition headed by William Fletcher, of Earl, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7786. Also, petition headed by M. Gipson, of Buckner, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7787. Also, petition headed by A. M. Emfinger, of Meadville, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7788. Also, petition headed by Will Reese, of Belcher, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7789. Also, petition headed by H. J. Johnson, of Louisville, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7790. Also, petition headed by W. C. Brooks, of Delta, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7791. Also, petition headed by Frank Turner, of Zwolle, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7792. Also, petition headed by D. C. Daniels, of Simsboro, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7793. Also, petition headed by J. A. Whisenant, of Moulton, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7794. Also, petition headed by D. H. Cain, of Blountsville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7795. Also, petition headed by M. D. Larimore, of Beecher City, Ill., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7796. Also, petition headed by Rufus Thompson, of Magnolia, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7797. Also, petition headed by L. Brill, of Shreveport, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7798. Also, petition headed by A. Herst, of Magnolia, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7799. Also, petition headed by E. Dempsey, of Warrior, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7800. Also, petition headed by A. H. Gardner, of Greenwood, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7801. Also, petition headed by James Henderson, of Salisbury, Mo., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7802. Also, petition headed by Joseph Hall, of Milan, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7803. Also, petition headed by Lewis J. Curry, of Hector, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7804. Also, petition headed by Fred Wolfe, of Nashville, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7805. Also, petition headed by R. D. Diggs, of Grapeland, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7806. Also, petition headed by Harry Mathews, of Gurley, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7807. Also, petition headed by J. Liverett, of Albertville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7808. Also, petition headed by Dave Buchanan, of Albertville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7809. Also, petition headed by J. W. Canerday, of St. Joseph, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7810. Also, petition headed by S. A. Smith, of Crossville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7811. Also, petition headed by Sam Evans, of Scottsboro, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7812. Also, petition headed by Dolphus Mize, of Haleyville, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7813. Also, petition headed by L. Chapman, of Memphis, Tenn., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7814. Also, petition headed by A. M. Drain, of Boaz, Ala., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7815. Also, petition headed by Mack Terry, of Dumas, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7816. Also, petition headed by Frank Davis, of Leland, N. C., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7817. Also, petition headed by J. M. Garrett, Sr., of Harrisville, Miss., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7818. Also, petition headed by W. H. Hughes, of Rayville, La., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7819. Also, petition headed by T. Collins, of Kevil, Ky., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7820. Also, petition headed by G. F. McGuire, of Boxwood, Va., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7821. Also, petition headed by J. Hopper, of Tinsman, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7822. Also, petition headed by John Gillispie, of Brasfield, Ark., favoring House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, the Pope plan for direct Federal old-age pensions of \$30 to \$50 a month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7823. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the New York State Legislature, urging the cooperation of the Federal Government in carrying out the national program of forest-land management for the purpose of producing a sustained and regular yield of timber products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7824. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Newark, N. J., favoring the Pettengill bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7825. By Mr. KERR: Petition of the North Carolina State Council of Textile Workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7826. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Petition of Layman Burgett and 50 additional residents of Fultonham, N. Y., and vicinity, opposing the Rayburn-Wheeler pub-

licity bill, and urging upon Congress to defeat this measure; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7827. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding the charter of the North River Bridge Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7828. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the New York Typographical Union, No. 6, New York City, concerning the Wagner labor relations bill; to the Committee on Labor.

7829. Also, petition of the New York Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, concerning the Wagner-Costigan antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7830. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of the Sixth Ward Democratic Club of Cleveland, Ohio, by their president, Fred Mueller, and secretary, Patrick Avon, urging support of their interests and the best interests of all the people of the United States by enactment of the Wheeler-Rayburn bill and/or other legislation to effectively regulate the public utilities and where and when feasible to abolish utility holding companies, whereas the Democratic Party in its platform stated, "We advocate protection of the investing public by requiring to be filed with the Government and carried in advertisements of all offerings of foreign and domestic stocks and bonds true information as to bonuses, commissions, principal invested, and interests of the sellers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7831. Also, petition of stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, and assistants, Local No. 19708, Toledo, Ohio, by their secretary, Elizabeth Connors, favoring the Wagner-Connery labor disputes bill, the Guffey bill on mining codes (S. 87), the Black bill, which provides for a 30-hour week in industry, and the continuation of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which expires June 15, since it is necessary to retain the code provisions for hours and wages because they represent a definite move in the right direction and believing that unless the gains already effected through National Recovery Administration codes can be made permanent through the continuation of the National Industrial Recovery Act that labor will receive a serious setback; to the Committee on Labor.

7832. Also, petition of stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, and assistants, Local No. 19708, Toledo, Ohio, by their secretary, Elizabeth Connors, favoring the passage of House bill 7172, known as the "Mead substitute bill", providing for sick leave and annual leave for postal substitutes, ratio of 1 substitute to 7 regulars, graduated pay from the present rate of 65 cents per hour to the rate of the third grade, and prohibition against furloughs or dismissals; also favoring House bill 6990, which provides for a 40-hour week for all postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7833. Also, petition of Branch 505 of the American Flint Glass Workers Union of Newark, Ohio, by their secretary, Helen Yerian, requesting support of the graduated tax on cigarettes in House bills 5450, 6124, 6368, and 6672; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7834. Also, petition of India Local No. 18346, Mogadore, Ohio, James W. Hamlin, and numerous others, urging the continuation of the National Recovery Administration, as they feel this program is vitally essential to the welfare and peace of this country; to the Committee on Labor.

7835. Also, petition of students and faculty of Bonebrake Theological Seminary, of Dayton, Ohio, headed by Joseph B. Henry, urging that the scheduled maneuvers be transferred to waters where all semblance of a threat to Japan will be removed, that the proposed budgets for the Army and Navy be substantially reduced, and that legislation be enacted which will eliminate profit from war, as they believe that now is the time to prepare for peace if we are going to have peace, and with deep conviction that our country is under moral obligation to set the pace in guaranteeing world peace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7836. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of Commander John Barry Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Perth Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.